270
G932

A

MANUAL OF CHURCH HISTORY

BY

HENRY E. F. GUERICKE,

DOCTOR AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN HALLE.

Translated from the German

BY

WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD,

BROWN PROFESSOR IN ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

ANCIENT CHURCH HISTORY,

COMPRISING THE FIRST SIX CENTURIES.

5719

Andover:
WARREN F. DRAPER.
BOSTON: WILLIAM H. HALLIDAY AND COMPANY.
NOS. 58 AND 60 CORNHILL.
PHILADELPHIA: SMITH, ENGLISH, & CO.
1869.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1857, by
WARREN F. DRAPER,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts

BRITISH ISLES NAZARENE
LIBRARY
COLLEGE

STEREOTYPED AND PRINTED BY
W. F. DRAPER.

PREFACE.

BY THE TRANSLATOR.

Guericke's Manual of Church History, of which the first division is now presented to the public in an English version, has passed through eight editions in Germany. The work was first published in 1833, and the last volume of the eighth edition appeared in 1855. The demand for so many re-issues of this hand-book, within the space of a little more than twenty years, in a country distinguished for the fecundity of its authorship, and the fastidiousness of its scholarship, affords strong presumptive evidence of its intrinsic merits. During the last twenty-five years, the German mind has been remarkably active in the department of Ecclesiastical History, and the growth of German literature in this direction has been luxuriant; and yet the manual of Guericke continues to hold a place certainly among the very first, as a book for students and lecture-rooms.

A brief specification of the leading characteristics of this work may appropriately accompany its first introduction to the American and English public.

1. The author is in hearty sympathy with the truths of revelation as they have been enunciated in the symbols, and

wrought into the experience of the Christian church from the beginning. Belonging to the High Lutheran branch of the German church, and also sharing to some extent, it must be conceded, in its recent narrowness whenever he approaches the points at issue between the Lutherans and Calvinists, he cordially adopts all the cardinal doctrines of the Protestant Reformation as they throbbed in the heart of Luther, and were organized into the oldest and in some respects the warmest of the Reformed Symbols, — the Augsburg confession. Such a living interest in the evangelical substance of Christianity, and such an intelligent and thorough reception of it into his own personal experience, it is needless to say, can alone prepare the historian of the Christian Church to enter vividly into its whole varied career. A writer's conception of the Christian religion and church must be inevitably moulded by his conception of the Person and Work of its Founder. "What think ye of Christ?" is a question whose answer locates the historian not less than the dogmatist. The writer of this history beholds in Jesus Christ the incarnation of Deity itself for the redemption of the world, and stands upon the high ground of Supernaturalism in reference to the origin, establishment, and perpetuity of the Christian religion. There is no equivocation or ambiguity in his use of these terms, or in his explanation of these and their cognate doctrines. The student of this manual, whatever else he may or may not find, will certainly find himself, so far as he follows the leadings of this investigator, in the very heart of the decided and frank orthodoxy of all unambiguous periods, and of all thoroughly sincere minds.

2. As a consequence of this interest in the evangelical doctrines, this historian places the highest estimate upon the internal history of the Church. The reader will, indeed, find the work a repository of information upon all points and

subjects that belong to Ecclesiastical History, — packed densely, and full, with names and dates and all the indispensable citation of the department, — but he will feel at every step that the causes and principles, the dogmatic ideas and moral forces, are ever foremost in the writer's mind. Hence this manual, to a degree, certainly, not exceeded by any other text-book, conducts the student into the course of *doctrinal development* with remarkable distinctness, fulness, and discrimination. Guericke does not regard the great polemic ages of the church as barren of interest, filled with controversies respecting merely speculative and unessential points, and displaying only the envies and jealousies of ambitious minds, or the hair-splitting subtilties of mere dialecticians. On the contrary, he has a warm sympathy with those deep and earnest spirits whom the Head of the Church has ever raised up, in order to make a fuller statement of the scripture truth when the advancing intelligence of the church has outgrown its past science, or to eliminate the needed antagonistic element in the revealed doctrine, when a defective, or a positively heretical position is being laid down as the faith once delivered to the saints. Believing that the Scriptures contain inspired truth, and that this truth, like all truth, is one and homogeneous, the writer of this work believes that it is possible for the human mind to reach it, and to make a definite statement thereof. He believes that the effort of the church to understand the written word has been measurably successful, and that its theological literature and its symbolism contain a plainly announced system, of which the distinctness is evinced by the loud and earnest opposition which it has ever called forth from the worldly and unbelieving mind, and whose inherent power is betokened by the triumphant calmness with which it maintains itself, even as an intellectual system, among all the mutations and declensions of systems reared outside of the Christian Church, and independent of the Christian Revelation.

Acting in accordance with this faith, this historian devotes particular attention to doctrinal history, and the student, it is believed, will find this section by no means the least interesting portion of the work, — a section, it may be added, which is most liable to suffer from imperfect treatment, or entire neglect, in a manual.

3. This manual will be found to be characterized by accuracy and learning. It has been a slow and gradual formation, by a German student and professor, during a period of thirty years. The first edition, compared with the last, is instructive as exhibiting the influx of materials, and their more powerful combination, and compression. Not a little of the difficulty of translating such a work arises from this gradual manner of its construction. The sentence in the first draught of the first edition was a simple proposition; in the last it has been separated into members, and interpolated with further matter, in the form of new facts, or qualifications, or expansion, until its bulk has become huge and unwieldy, though exceedingly comprehensive and exhaustively descriptive. Formed thus slowly by accretion, this work contains the results of the investigations and studies of German scholars during the last quarter of a century. For it is evident that a *manual* of history cannot be an original work to any very great extent. Its individual author may indeed make some new contributions of his own to the stock of facts, but his chief power must be shown in the industry and comprehensiveness with which he collects, the skill with which he methodizes and combines, and the energy with which he condenses and vivifies the historical materials given to his hand. Guericke, in Ancient and Mediaeval Church History, follows very closely, particularly in the merely nar-

rative parts, in the footsteps of Neander; differing from him, however, in having a higher estimate than this great historian possessed of scientific theology, and siding with more earnestness and firmness with the determinate results of doctrinal speculation as embodied in the symbols.

The interest which this historian takes in the internal history is seen, also, in the fulness with which he analyzes and exhibits the contents of the writings of the leading minds in Church History. It will be difficult to find within the same space such a complete sketch of the works of men like Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius, Jerome, and Chrysostom, — of their topics, and their mode of treating them, — as is given in this manual. The whole history of an individual mind, as seen in the tracts and treatises which it produces, is often exhibited upon a single page.[1]

4. Guericke's work, if we are not mistaken, hits the mean between the full and flowing narration of history proper, and the mere meagre synopsis or epitome. It cannot be expected that a manual should be characterized by the expansion and illustration of a voluminous work, in which the lights and shadows, and all the varied and picturesque coloring of historical narrative, have room and right to appear. The purpose of a hand-book for the lecture-room would be defeated, if the writer should yield to the temptation to pass beyond terse, rapid, and close sketching. But, on the other hand, in order to the highest success it is required in the manualist, that he indicate and exhibit the line of continuous connection which meanders through all the items, phenomena, and detail of his department. His outlining must be sufficiently filled up to show the reader that History is a process of development, and not a mere table of contents.

---

[1] Compare pp. 219 sq., 229 sq., 329, 337, 374 sq.

This difficult task seems to have been measurably performed by the writer of this work; so that even the student who has perused no other history of the Christian Church will find his mind led along with interest, because he perceives that there is a connection and fusion of the individual parts; and, on the other hand, he who passes from the perusal of a larger work like that of Neander or Milman to this one, will be aided and interested by finding the great stream of history flowing within narrower channels, and the whole great expanse reduced to a bird's-eye view. It is confidently believed, that one of the values of this manual will be found in that it groups and generalizes for the student of history a vast mass of information which without some after-study of this sort is apt to roll over the mind in one wide and obliterating deluge. Whether the work be regarded as a repository of information in reference to the entire sum-total of facts and phenomena, and able to stand by itself upon the historic shelf, or whether it be used as a supplementary aid to the general reader and student, in marshalling and memorizing materials which he has obtained from other sources, it will be found to be of the first value.

Whoever shall compare the version with the original will not find it an ad verbum translation. To have merely *construed* this German author, would have been to have produced an unintelligible book. The work from beginning to end has been recast, so that while the author furnishes the substance, the translator hopes that the form, style, and diction exhibit in some degree the traits and qualities of the English mind.

This volume includes an entire historic division in the author's plan, — that, namely, of the *Ancient* Church.[1] The first six centuries in Ecclesiastical History are a whole by themselves which it is profitable to study and contemplate by itself. The Ancient, as distinguished from the Mediaeval Church, is the Apostolic and Patristic Church, as distinguished from the Papal. For although the commencement of the corruption and apostasy is traceable in the last half of these six centuries, yet the influence of the Pentecostal effusion, of the first great missionary effort, of the great polemic contest for the scriptural faith, and of the great scriptural doctrines which were embodied in the first symbols, was by no means entirely spent, and it is not until the second stadium of the nine centuries that succeed the first six, that Anti-Christ actually seats himself in the temple of God.

---

[1] The second volume comprises the history of the *Mediaeval* Church, and the third volume that of the *Modern*.

It is this first grand division of Church History, — the morning prime of the Church Universal and Undivided, — which is now presented in this volume in an English dress. The translator may, with the Divine permission, at some future day endeavor to make the other divisions of this manual accessible to the English reader. Whether this be done or not, the present volume has an independent unity and worth by itself, and will serve, it is believed, to put the modern student into actual and quickening communication with by far the most interesting and valuable portion of Church History back of the Reformation.

W. G. T. SHEDD.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
ANDOVER, March, 1857.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

Page
§ 1. The Church . . . 1
2. Church History: its problem and method . . . 3
3. Sources of Church History . . . 5
4. Auxiliary Sciences . . . 6
5. Coördinate, and subordinate branches of Church History . 7
6. Critical survey of the literature in Church History . . 10

FIRST PERIOD: TO A. D. 311.

PART FIRST.

THE FOUNDING OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

CHAPTER FIRST.

RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF THE WORLD AT THE ADVENT OF CHRIST.

§ 7. Paganism . . . 21
8. Judaism . . . 23
9. Relations of Heathenism and Judaism to Christianity . . 28

CHAPTER SECOND.

JESUS CHRIST.

§ 10. The New Testament view of the person and work of Christ 30
11. Sketch of the earthly life of Christ . . . 34
Appendix: 1. Chronological Data. 2. Pretended writings of Christ. 3. Contemporaneous notices of Christ by profane writers. 4. Pretended contemporaneous accounts of the life of Christ . . . 39

CHAPTER THIRD.

FIRST APPEARING OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Page.
§ 12. Pentecostal effusion of the Holy Spirit 43
Appendix: Speaking with Tongues 44

CHAPTER FOURTH.

THE APOSTLES: AND THEIR MISSIONARY LABORS.

§ 13. The college of Apostles 46
Appendix: Theory of the Tübingen School . . . 48
14. Peter 49
15. Paul 54
16. James 64
17. John 67

PART SECOND.

CAREER OF THE CHURCH DURING THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

SECTION FIRST.

THE SPREAD AND LIMITATION OF CHRISTIANITY.

CHAPTER FIRST.

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 18. Spread of Christianity in particular countries . . . 70
19. Causes and furtherances of the spread of Christianity . . 74

CHAPTER SECOND.

OPPOSITION TO CHRISTIANITY.

§ 20. Jewish Persecution 77
21—27. *Pagan Persecution* . . . . 79—98
21. Causes of persecution within the Roman Empire . . . 79
22. Persecutions to the reign of Nerva 81
23. Persecutions under Trajan, Hadrian, and Antoninus Pius . 84
24. Persecution under Marcus Aurelius 86
25. Persecutions from Commodus to Philip the Arabian . . 89
26. Persecutions from Decius to Diocletian 91
27. The Diocletian persecution 94
28. Pagan Writers against Christianity 99
Appendix: Jewish Anti-Christian Writings 102
29. Christian Apologists 102

SECTION SECOND.

CHURCH POLITY.

Page.

§ 30: 1. Constitution of the church in the Apostolic Age. 2. Constitution of the church after the Apostolic Age . . . 106
31. Relation of the churches to each other 116
32. The one catholic church, and its representative . . . 118
33. Church discipline 121
34. Schisms: 1. Felicissimus. 2. Novatian. 3. Meletian . 123

SECTION THIRD.

CHRISTIAN LIFE AND WORSHIP.

§ 35. Christian life 127
36. Public religious assemblies and services 131
37. Places of worship 132
38. Religious days and festivals 134
39. Celebration of the sacraments: 1. Baptism. 2. The Lord's Supper 139

SECTION FOURTH.

HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

§ 40. General survey 146

CHAPTER FIRST.

HERESIES AND SECTS.

§ 41. Classification of heretical sects: 1. Judaistic. 2. Oriental-Theosophic. 3. Fanatic-Ascetical. 4. Rationalistic . 151
42. Arch-heretics (so-called) 152
43. *Judaistic Sects:* 1. Ebionites. 2. Nazarenes. 3. Elcesaites 154
44—54. *Oriental-Theosophic Sects* . . . . . 157—191
44: 1. Nature and characteristics of Gnosticism. 2. Species of Gnosticism. 3. The problems of Gnosticism. 4. The Gnostic idea of redemption. 5. Gnostic ethics. 6. Extent of Gnosticism 157
45. Cerinthus 165
46. Basilides 166
47. Valentinus, and his school 169
48. Ophites 173
49. Saturninus 175
50. Tatian, and the Encratites 177

Page.
§ 51. Eclectic-Antinomian Gnostics 178
52. Marcion, and his school 180
53. Hermogenes 183
Appendix: Church doctrine of creation from nothing . 183
54. Manichaeism and the Manichaeans 185
55. *Fanatic-Ascetical Sects:* 1. Montanists. 2. Chiliasts . . 191
56. *Rationalistic Sects:* 1. Patripassians; Praxeas, Noëtus, Beryl. 2. Nominal Trinitarians; Paul of Samosata, Sabellius. 3. Humanitarians; Ebionites, Theodotians, Alogi . . 197
Appendix: Catholic doctrine of the Trinity . . . 202

CHAPTER SECOND.

PRINCIPAL CHURCH TEACHERS, AND THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS.

§ 57. The Apostolical Fathers, and Justin Martyr . . . 210
58. Asia-Minor, and North-African Fathers; Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Julius Africanus, Tertullian, Cyprian . . . 216
59. The Alexandrine and Origenistic School 222
60. The Antiochian School 237

SECOND PERIOD: A. D. 311—590.

SECTION FIRST.

THE SPREAD AND LIMITATION OF CHRISTIANITY.

CHAPTER FIRST.

CHRISTIANITY WITHIN THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

§ 61. The church under Constantine and Constantius . . . 238
62. The church under Julian the Apostate 243
63. The church under the Emperors after Julian . . . 246
64. Pagan polemical writers, and Christian Apologists . . 247

CHAPTER SECOND.

CHRISTIANITY BEYOND THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

§ 65. Instrumentalities to the spread of Christianity . . . 251
66. Christianity in Asia 252
67. Christianity in Africa 257
68. Christianity in Europe 258

SECTION SECOND.

CHURCH POLITY.

Page.
§ 69. Relation of the Church to the State 263
70. The Clergy 268
71. The Episcopate and Patriarchate 271
72. The Donatist Schism 278

SECTION THIRD.

CHRISTIAN LIFE AND WORSHIP.

CHAPTER FIRST.

CHRISTIAN LIFE.

§ 73. Antagonistic tendencies 284
74. Monachism: 1. In the East. 2. In the West . . . 285
75. Opposition to the Ascetic spirit 292

CHAPTER SECOND.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

§ 76. Assemblages for worship 294
77. Church Edifices 295
78. Christian Festivals 297
79. Celebration of the Sacraments: 1. Baptism. 2. The Lord's Supper 301
80. Veneration of Saints, of Martyrs, of Mary; Pilgrimages . 303

SECTION FOURTH.

HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

CHAPTER FIRST.

THEOLOGY AND CONTROVERSIES.

§ 81. Different theological tendencies 306
82—85. *Arian and connected controversies* . . . 310—335
82. Views prevalent at the beginning of this period . . . 310
83. History of the controversy to the year 325 313
84. History of the controversy from 325—356 316
85. History of the controversy after the year 356 . . . 323
86. The Origenistic and connected controversies . . . 336
87—90. *Controversies relating to the Person of Christ* . 345—370

Page.
§ 87. Till the Nestorian controversy 345
88. The Nestorian controversy 350
89. Eutychian controversy 356
90. Monophysite and connected controversies 360
91—93. *Pelagian and connected controversies* . . . 371—398
91. Augustine and Pelagius 371
92. The Pelagian controversy 384
93. The Semi-Pelagian controversy 390

CHAPTER SECOND.

SECTS.

94. Audians, Priscillianists, Hypsistarians, etc. 399

Chronological Table 405
General Index 413

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1.

THE CHURCH.

After the original and pure consciousness of God, implanted by the Creator himself in human nature, had become corrupted by the apostasy of man, and, instead of fastening upon the true God alone, had confounded God with nature, the Creator with creation (Comp. 1 Cor. x. 20), and thus had produced pantheism and polytheism in their manifold forms, and with their manifold enormities, there still remained a single people, among whom, according to a particular decree of God and through a wonderful divine institute, the belief in the one true God, and his worship, had been preserved from the beginning.

To this people God, by *Moses* his servant, gave a holy law, in order to produce in them a deep knowledge and feeling of sin and guilt, and announced by his prophets, with gradually increasing distinctness, the joyful message — the consolation of fallen humanity from the beginning (Gen. iii. 15) — that from them the Redeemer should go forth, the Light of the world, who should take away sin and guilt from the human race by his holy obedience and expiatory death, and by his exaltation should impart a new and blessed life to all of every nation, Jews first and afterwards the Heathen, who by joining themselves to Him in living faith should become his possession.

Compare this with [illegible]

Jesus Christ, this Redeemer, appeared at the appointed time, completed his redemptive work by his death, sealed it by his resurrection, and blessed it, after his return to the Father, by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit; through which effusion the *Christian* Church on earth came into existence.

The Christian Church is the union of all who are called and chosen (an *ἐκκλησία* internally, as well as externally), through the Word and Spirit of God, to be the possession of the Lord (*κυριακόν*, kirk, church); who are united together by the public confession of a common faith in the Redeemer; and whose destination it is to promote each other's edification, and coöperate towards the spread of this faith, for the illumination sanctification and blessedness of humanity, and the ever widening manifestation of the kingdom of God in it. From the beginning of its existence, engaged in constant internal and external conflict with all that is ungodly in the world, but destined to a final and eternal triumph, the Christian Church is in its essence an invisible society held together by the invisible bond of the Holy Spirit; but visible in its manifestation (*ἐκκλησία* in the common acceptation), having an outward organization and polity, corresponding so far as is possible with such an animating spirit, and distinguished by the ministration of the word and the sacraments.

The connection of Church History with Universal History, may be thus represented. The history of the Universe comprises two eras. The *first* embraces the production of the creature by the almighty power of the Creator. This, inasmuch as it occurs in time, is by gradations, and therefore has a history; but inasmuch as it is the work of Deity, it has a uniformly normal history. The *second* era embraces the creature's own free and personal development. But since the creature is self-determined, this history may be either normal or abnormal — an evolution or a revolution — according as freedom is used or abused. Two such revolutions occur in this second era in the history of the Universe. *First*, the fall of a portion of the angelic host, succeeded by no restitution. *Secondly*, the fall of the human race, succeeded by the restitution of a portion of it. The general history of mankind, consequently, becomes divided into natural or secular, and supernatural or sacred. This latter, or the history of Redemption, is the history of the restoration of the true development of humanity, as this was originally intended in the Creator's idea and act, and is supernatural in its principle and causes. In its entire extent it includes the following *stadia.* The *first* extends from the apostasy to the deluge, and is the period of the Antediluvian church. The *second* stadium reaches from the deluge to the calling of Abraham, comprising the age of the Patriarchal church. The *third* stadium is the era of the Jewish church, and includes the period of immediate preparation for the advent and work of the Redeemer. The *fourth* stadium beginning with the incarnation and ending with the last judgment, comprises the history of the militant Christian Church, which ushers in the *fifth* and last stadium, — the eternal state, ὁ αἰων μέλλῶν. See Kurtz Abhandlung in Zeitschrift für luth. Theologie, 1843.

§ 2.

CHURCH HISTORY: ITS PROBLEM AND METHOD.

The fitting representation of the continuous and connected career of this blended internal and external association, is *Church History.* Where, and how, the Christian Church has extended itself in conflict with its opposite, the world; what has been the relation which its visible body, in the midst of human infirmity, has at all times sustained to the invisible spirit animating it; what it has accomplished in the various periods of time, in the conflict with error and evil in its own membership, and in humanity at large; and, finally, how it has fulfilled its own ideal destination: to develop all this in a historical sequence, is the *problem* of Church History. To meet this problem, a mere chronological arrangement of the facts is by no means sufficient. The phenomena must be unfolded genetically, from their causes; and this too, not from the coöperation of merely external causes — a method which would entirely degrade and distort all the grander phenomena, — but primarily and chiefly from the inmost principle lying under all ecclesiastical phenomena, whether it be Christian and eternal, or human and temporal in its nature. In this way the true relation of the external history to the internal appears, and the positive or negative influence of the former upon the latter is delineated.

In respect to the *method* of Church History: the most suitable mode of treatment combines the *chronological* with the *causal* connection of events. Consequently, Church History divides into certain ages and periods corresponding with certain great sections in the historical development itself, and, in each period, follows a natural distribution of the materials, made with constant reference to the general problem of the science itself. Thus, Church History divides into three principal *divisions*, corresponding to the three principal modifications of the Christian life. The first six centuries, embracing the time during which Christianity was in its bloom upon the old classic soil, constitute the foundation of ecclesiastical history in its entire scope, both external and internal. The nine centuries following, exhibit, in an equally connected sequence, the erection upon this foundation of a superstructure of totally different character and proportions. The remaining three centuries, include the history of the purifying and purified, the rejuvenating and rejuvenated, church. Hence the denominations of the eras of the church, having reference to time merely, would be the Ancient, the Mediaeval, and the Modern; or denominating with reference to nationalities, the Graeco-Roman, the Romano-German, and the Germano-European. The subdivision of these three principal *divisions*, into smaller *periods*, by events that form natural epochal points, is of less importance so far as concerns the general view of the whole field, and allows more room for individual judgment. We find seven of such periods.

The first period extends to the time of Constantine; when Christianity had become the religion of the Roman Empire. A D. 311.

The second extends from Constantine to Gregory the Great; when the supremacy of the Roman bishop had become established in the Western Church. A. D. 311–590.

The third period extends from Gregory the Great to the death of Charlemagne. A. D. 590–814.

The fourth period extends from the death of Charlemagne to the accession of Gregory VII. A. D. 814–1073.

The fifth period extends from Gregory VII. to Boniface VIII. A. D. 1073–1294.

The sixth period extends from Boniface VIII. to the Reformation. A. D. 1294–1517.

The seventh period extends from the Reformation to the present time. A. D. 1517–1850.

In each single period, the subject matter divides into *sections* relating to: 1. The spread and limitation of Christianity; 2. Ecclesiastical polity; 3. Christian life and worship; 4. History of doctrine.

§ 3.

SOURCES OF CHURCH HISTORY.

All materials that serve to establish facts upon a credible foundation, and to throw light upon them, are sources. They are partly direct or immediate, partly indirect or mediate.

Immediate sources, are: 1. *Monuments* of art and *inscriptions;*[1] both of them, sources of secondary value: 2. *Original documents.* Of the latter, there is a variety. For almost all portions of Church history, and especially for the history of polity and morals, the *letters* of the more influential minds in the church are important; for Church polity, the *civil statutes* that relate to the affairs of the Church are particularly valuable;[2] for Church polity, worship, and the history of doctrine, — the *acts of councils*,[3] as well as the *official writings* of the popes;[4] for Christian life and morals, — the *rules of monastic orders;*[5] for life and doctrine, — the *sermons* of leading theologians; for worship and doctrine, — the *liturgies;*[6] for the history of doctrine, — the *apologies*, and *confessional writings*,[1] and, generally, the strictly *dogmatic* and *polemic* writings of theologians.

---

[1] Ciampini Vett. monumenta. Münter Sinnbilder.

[2] Codex Theodosianus and Codex Justinianeus contain those of the Roman Emperors. Collectio Baluzii contains those of the French Kings, and Collectio Haiminsfeldii those of the German Emperors.

[3] Conciliorum Collectio Regia, 47 vols. Mansi Collectio, 31 vols. Harduin Collectio, 22 vols.

[4] Coquelines Collectio Bullarum, 28 vols.

[5] Holstenii Codex Regularum, 4 vols; auctus a Brockie, 6 vols.

[6] Assemani Codex liturgicus eccles. universae, 13 vols.

Mediate sources, are *Church histories:* for these furnish, not an immediate impress and constituent part of history, but as it were a commentary upon the direct sources. The historian narrates only according to his own knowledge and view, from which narrative, the pure facts, freed from subjective modifications, are to be eliminated in accordance with the rules of historical criticism.

§ 4.

AUXILIARY SCIENCES.

Since the Church is that highest and holiest union among men, to which all other historical processes are subservient, either positively or negatively, it is evident that Church history both requires, and promotes, all other historical investigations.

The *general auxiliary sciences* are the following. 1. For the history of the outward extension, and the constitution, of the Church, of special value, are first, the *general history of the world*, together with the *political history of single nations;* secondly, the *history of civil law*, and particularly, a knowledge of the *constitutions* of those countries in which the Church was established. 2. For the history of the internal life of the Church, and of Christian doctrine, of value, are the *history of culture*, and particularly a knowledge of the *religions* of the countries into which Christianity extended itself. 3. For the history of doctrine, the *history of philosophy and of literature* is of the first importance.

Besides these, there are *special sciences auxiliary to Church history*, according as philological, critical, geographical, or chronological elements are required. There are four of these.

---

[1] Walch Bibliotheca symbolica vetus (contains the earlier). Winer Comparative Darstellung. Streitwolf Collectio (Papal). Hase Libri symbolici (Lutheran). Niemeyer Collectio (Reformed).

1. *Ecclesiastical Philology;* an aid to the understanding of the earlier sources of Church history.[1]

2. *Ecclesiastical Diplomatics;* an aid to the critical examination of the genuineness, integrity, and credibility of the sources of Ecclesiastical history; a branch not yet much cultivated.[2]

3. *Ecclesiastical Geography;* an aid to the knowledge of the place in which events occur.[3]

4. *Ecclesiastical Chronology;* an aid to the knowledge of the time in which events occur.[4]

§ 5.

COORDINATE, AND SUBORDINATE, BRANCHES OF CHURCH HISTORY.

The particular parts of the subject of Church history (see § 2) cannot, it is evident, receive a detailed and full treatment in a general history of the Christian Church. Hence single parts, when of sufficient weight and importance to justify such a treatment, have been detached and investigated by themselves, thus forming coördinate and subordinate branches of Church history. In this manner the following departments of inquiry have been formed:

1. *The History of Missions;* springing from the general history of the spread and limitation of the Church.[5]

2. *Christian Archaeology;* springing from the general his-

---

[1] For the later Latin, Du Frèsne (Dom. Du Cange) Glossarium. 6 vols. For the later Greek, Du Frèsne Glossarium, 7 vols; and especially Suicer Thesaurus. 2 vols.

[2] Mabillon De re diplomatica.

[3] Spanhemii Geographia sacra et eccl. Wiltsch Handbuch d. kirch. Geographie; Atlas sacer. Robinson Biblical Researches. Ritter Erdkunde. Möller Hierographie.

[4] Piper Kirchenrechnung.

[5] Fabricii Salutaris lux evangelii toti orbi exoriens. Blumhardt Missions-Geschichte (incomplete.) Schmidt Missions-Geschichte. Brown History of Missions since the Reformation. Tracy History of American Missions. Neander Church History, Section I. throughout the work. For the history of Modern Missions, rich materials are to be found in the journals of the American, English, and Continental Missionary Societies.

tory of polity and worship. Archaeology is an exhibition of the *formal* aspects of the Church. The first six centuries, constituting as they do the antiquity of the Church, are of great importance; but it is an error to confine archaeological investigations to this age. Besides this period, in which the foundations of forms and polities were laid, there is a degenerating *mediaeval*, and a reformatory *modern*, period, each of which must be examined in order to a complete archaeology of the Christian Church.[1]

3. *The History of Christian Life*, as seen in the general Church, and in the historic individual.[2]

4. From the general subject of *Doctrine* spring the following coördinate branches.

a. *The History of Christian Doctrines.* In the gift of the gospel, and at the first establishment of the Church, the entire sum and substance of Christian truth was given. But this body of dogma was by no means fully understood by the human mind, in the outset. The clear apprehension of this in itself finished and final revelation of God, by the mind of the Church, and a systematic statement of it in all its elements, together with their mutual relations, is a *gradual process*, becoming more and more self-consistent and all-comprehending, but even now not complete. The account of this *development of the intelligence of the Church*, constitutes the History of Opinions.[1]

---

[1] Bingham Antiquities of the Christian Church, 10 vols. Augusti Denkwürdigkeiten, 12 parts. (Abridgment, 3 vols.). Rheinwald Archaeologie. Böhmer Christ. Alterthumswissenschaft. Coleman Christian Antiquities. Including all periods, early, mediaeval, and modern, are the following: Pellicia Politia; edited by Ritter and Braun. Binterim Denkwürdigkeiten, 12 vols. Upon special topics, are the following: Martene De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus. Planck Geschichte der kirchlichen Gesellschaftsverfassung, 5 vols. Staudenmaier Geschichte der Bischofswahlen. Rothe Anfänge der Kirche. Baur Ursprung des Episcopats. Augusti Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte und Liturgik.

[2] Ruinart Acta primorum martyrum. Bollandi Acta sanctorum, 53 vols. Arnold Abbildung der ersten Christen. Müller Reliquien. Neander Denkwürdigkeiten, and especially Section III. of his General Church History. Du Pin Bibliotheque des auteurs ecclesiastiques, 47 vols. Du Pin Bibliotheque des auteurs séparés de la communion de l'eglisse Rom du 16 et 17 siecle. Cave Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum historia literaria. Tillemont Memoires pour servir a l'histoire eccl. des six premiers siecles. Fabricii Bibliotheca Graeca. Möhler Patrologie. Lumper Historia theol. crit. de vita, scriptis, et doctrina patrum. Böhringer Kirchengeschichte in Biographieen. — The following are the principal collections of the writings of the Fathers. Magna Bibliotheca vett. patrum. 17 parts fol. Maxima Bibl. vett. patrum, 27 parts fol. Gallandi Bibl. vett. patrum, 14 parts fol. The following are supplementary collections. Canisius Lectiones antiq., 6 vols. fol. Combefisius Patrum bibliothecae novum auctarium, 4 vols. fol. D'Achery Spicilegium, 13 vols. fol. Pez Thesaurus anecdotorum, 6 vols. fol. Martene and Durand Amplissima Collectio, 9 vols. fol. Maï Collectio e Vatican. codd. Fragmentary remains are found in Grabe Spicilegium; and Routh Reliquiae Sacrae.

b. *The History of Symbols*, is the scientific exhibition of this course of doctrinal development, as it becomes embodied in public creeds and confessions of faith. *Symbolism* is consequently the proper completion of the History of Doctrines. It exhibits the origin of the *definitive* and *authoritative* form of that truth which, in the course of controversy with infidelity without, and heresy within, the Church, has been in continual flux, because gradually clarifying itself from foreign elements, and flowing into purer and clearer forms of conception and statement.[2]

c. *The History of Christian Theology, and of the theological sciences.*[3]

---

[1] *General treatises.* Petavius De theologicis dogmatibus, 5 vols. Münscher Dogmengeschichte, edited by Von Cölln. Baumgarten-Crusius Dogmengeschichte. Hagenbach Dogmengeschichte, translated by Buch. Gieseler Dogmengeschichte, edited by Redepenning. Neander Church History, Section IV., throughout the work. Kliefoth Einleitung. Baur Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte.

Special treatises. Walch Historie der Ketzereien, 11 vols. Baur Versöhnungslehre, 1 vol.; Dreieinigkeitslehre, 3 vols. Dorner Person Christi, 2 vols. Meier Trinitatslehre, 1 vol. Pearson On the Creed, 1 vol. Waterland History of the Athanasian Creed. Horsley Tracts. Bull Defensio Fidei Nicaenae. Harvey The Three Creeds. The *Theologia polemica* of the 17th century, furnishes valuable materials for doctrinal history: e. g. Chemnitz Examen Concilii Tridentini. Gerhard Loci Theologici. Quenstedt Theologia Dogmatico-polemica.

[2] Planck Darstellung der dogmatischen Systeme. Marheineke Symbolik. Th. 1. (Catholicism), 3 vols. Winer Comparative Darstellung. Möhler Symbolik, translated by Robertson (Catholic view). Baur Gegensatz des Katholicismus und Protestantismus. Nitzsch Beantwortung der Möhler's Symbolik. Guericke Allgemeine Christliche Symbolik.

[3] Flügge Geschichte der theol. Wissenschaften. Stäudlin Geschichte der theol. Wissenschaften

§ 6.

CRITICAL SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE IN CHURCH HISTORY.

1. The New Testament writings furnish the only reliable account of the Christian Church in the first ages of its existence. The *Acts of the Apostles* written by Luke, in particular, contain a full history of its first establishment among both the Jews and Heathen. The Church was soon compelled to enter upon apologetic and dogmatic labors, and hence we find no historical composition until we reach the time of *Hegesippus*, of Asia Minor, in the middle of the 2nd century, of whose five books, entitled *ὑπομνήματα τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πράξεων,* only a few fragments have been preserved by Eusebius. The learned, and generally fair minded *Eusebius*, bishop of Caesarea in the first half of the 4th century, is regarded as the father of Church history. Of his writings there are extant, a Chronicle[1] extending from the creation to the Nicene Council, and a Church History[2] in 10 books (to the year 324), particularly valuable for the many documents and fragments of earlier writers whose works have been lost which it contains. As a continuation of this latter work, he wrote a treatise in four books, De vita Constantini, highly panegyrical in its character, and in addition to this an Oratio de laudibus Constantini. In the 5th century, four other Greeks followed the example set by Eusebius, and wrote a continuation of his history: two jurists of Constantinople; one, the candid and sincere *Socrates*, who composed a history in seven books, extending from 306 to 439; the other, the elegant and ascetic *Hermias Sozomenus*, who wrote a history in nine books, comprising the time from 323 to 423: a learned theologian, the Syrian bishop *Theodoret*, whose work in five books includes the period from 325 to 427; and the Arian *Philostorgius*, of whose

---

[1] Chronicon, lately discovered in an Armenian version, and edited in Armenian and Latin by Aucher, 2 vols.

[2] Edited by Burton. Oxford, 1838. 2 vols; translated by Cruse.

latitudinarian Church history in twelve books, extending from 300 to 425, only some extracts have been preserved by Photius. In the 6th century, *Theodorus*, a lector of a church in Constantinople, made a compilation from the writings of Socrates, Sozomenus, and Theodoret, and wrote a continuation from 439 to 518, which the Syrian jurist *Evagrius* brought down to 594.[1]

The Latin historians drew their materials principally from Greek sources. The presbyter *Rufinus* of Aquilea, about the close of the 4th century, translated the history of Eusebius into Latin, and continued it down to 395.[2] This translation is valuable as an aid to the critical emendation of the text of the original. A little later, the Gallic presbyter *Sulpicius Severus* composed his Historia Sacra, commencing with the creation of the world, and ending A. D., 400.[3] In the 6th century *Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus*, once a consul, but afterwards a retired monk, compiled, in the retirement of his cloister, and assisted by *Epiphanius Scholasticus*, his Historia Tripartita, from the works of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. This was the manual of the middle ages.[4]

2. In the Middle Ages, and in the Western Church, we find for the most part mere epitomists and chroniclers. The works of the latter, though needing to be used with great discrimination, are rich in materials for the history of life and morals during this period.[5] Besides these there were a few writers of talents and reputation. *Gregory*, bishop of Tours († 595), wrote the history of the French church down to the year 591.[6] The English presbyter *Bede* († 735), composed a chronicle coming down to 721, and a history of the English Church ending with the year 731. In the 9th cen-

---

[1] Eusebii Pamphili, Socratis Scholastici, Hermiae Sozomeni, Theodoreti et Evagrii, item Philostorgii et Theodori Lectoris, quae exstant historiae ecclesiasticae, graece et latine, ed. Henricus Valesius, Paris. 1659. and Amsterdam. 1695. Re-edited Cambridge. 1720, by Reading. Translations of the first five have been published by Bagster, 6 vols.

[2] Edidit Cacciari a Bononia, Rome 1740.

[3] Ed. Hofmeister, Tig. 1708.

[4] Ed. Garetius, Rothom. 1679. Ven. 1729.

[5] Chronica medii aevi. Roesler, Tubingen 1798.

[6] In Bouquet's Rerum Gallic. et Franc. script. Vol. II.

tury, *Haymo*, bishop of Halberstadt († 853), compiled a church history principally from Rufinus's translation of Eusebius; as did also the Romish presbyter and librarian *Anastasius* from three Greek chroniclers; hence named Chronographia Tripartita.[1] In the 11th century, the canon *Adam of Bremen* acquired distinction as a church historian. His work, comprising the period from Charlemagne to Henry IV., is of much value in reference to the history of the archbishopric of Hamburg-Bremen, and of the Danish and Swedish churches.[2] The revival of learning, immediately preceding the Reformation, though it produced no eminent church historians, led to a more thorough criticism of past efforts and results; as the example of the Romish canon *Laurentius Valla* († 1546) evinces.[3]

In the East, owing to the stronger historical spirit and the closer connection between the Church and the State, the secular historians, the so-called *Scriptores Byzantini*, are valuable sources for Ecclesiastical history. Besides these, the Egyptian *Eutychius*, catholic bishop of Alexandria († 940), composed in Arabic a chronicle of church history extending from the creation to the year 937[4]; and in the 14th century *Nicephorus Callisti* wrote the history of the church to the year 911, of which nothing is extant after the year 610.

3. The Reformation awakened a new interest in Church history. The Lutheran and Roman Catholic churches, accomplished most in general church history; the Reformed and Roman Catholic, in special departments of the subject.

LUTHERAN HISTORIANS. In the middle of the 16th century, an association of Lutheran theologians, of whom *Matthias Flacius Illyricus* was the principal, composed a great work which contains the history of the Church down to the 13th century, drawn from the original sources, and enriched with copious extracts and documents taken from them. This work, entitled *Centuriae Magdeburgenses*, was constructed chiefly for the purpose of exposing the Roman Catholic falsifications of the history of the Church.[1] The interest in church history slumbered among the Lutherans for more than a century after the production of this work, until, in the middle of the 17th century, *George Calixt* revived it by his researches conducted in a critical and scientific spirit, mostly however upon the foundation laid by the Centuriators. Towards the close of the 17th century, historical studies received an impulse from the investigations of *Gottfried Arnold;*[2] a man whose mind had been stimulated to a freer historical feeling by the pietistic controversies of his time, but who, in opposing the narrow strictness of the predominant party in the Lutheran Church, sometimes fell into the opposite extreme, and formed a too favorable and undiscriminating estimate of fanatical and heretical sectaries. In the beginning of the 18th century, *Christian Eberhard Weismann*,[3] a man of mild and truth-loving spirit, while cultivating the whole field, paid special attention to modern Ecclesiastical history; but his reputation was soon eclipsed by the productions of *John Lawrence Mosheim*,[4] who was the first to impart a *classic* form to the materials of Church history. Of Mosheim's contemporaries, *Sigismund Jac. Baumgarten*[5] deserves mention as an industrious investigator, who was however much surpassed by his pupil, *John Salomon Semler*,[6] whose merits in historical criticism would have been greater and more permanent, had he yielded less to his sceptical and neological bias. The close of the 18th and beginning of the 19th century was marked by the labors of a disciple of Mosheim, *John Matthias Schröckh.*[1] These cover the entire field; are most industrious and exhaustive, but exceedingly prolix and languid. Semler applies the knife of hypercriticism to the very heart of the Church and its history; Schröckh collects and uses all materials indiscriminately.[2]

---

[1] Edited by Becker, in the Scriptores Byzantini.

[2] Fabricius Scriptores rer. Germanic. Asmussen De fontibus Adami Bremensis.

[3] His tract, De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione, is especially valuable.

[4] In Pococke's Annales Patrum Alex., Oxford 1658.

[5] Ed. Ducaeus, Paris 1630.

---

[1] Ecclesiastica Historia * * congesta per aliquot pios et studiosos viros in urbe Magdeburgica. Basil 1557–1574, 13 vols. The first six volumes edited by Semler, Nuremburg 1757–65. Osiander epitomized it, and continued it to the 16th century: Epitomes Hist. Eccl. Centuriae XVI. Tub. 1592.

[2] Unpartheiische Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie (to 1688), Frankfort. 1699.

[3] Introductio in memorabilia hist. eccl. Tubingen 1718 and Halle 1745. Contemporary historical writers with Weismann in the Lutheran Church, were Buddeus, Fabricius, Löscher, and Pfaff.

[4] His principal work is: Institutionum historiae ecclesiae antiquae et recentioris libri IV. Helmstadt 1755 (translated into English by Maclaine and Murdock). Of much value are Institutiones historiae ecclesiae majores sec. I.; Commentarii de rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum (translated by Vidal and Murdock); and Dissertationes ad hist. eccl. pertinentes.

[5] Auszug der Kirchengeschichte; continued by Semler to the 10th century

[6] Historiae ecclesiae selecta capita. Halle 1767. Commentarii historici de an-

The Lutheran Church in the 19th century has been convulsed by two great conflicts; one between rationalism and supernaturalism, and the other between pantheism and theism; which have left their impress upon ecclesiastical history, as well as upon all other departments of intellectual effort. The opening of the century witnessed a construction of the history of the Christian religion, even more crude and prejudiced than that of Semler, in the works of *Henke;*[3] in which the rationalizing spirit reached its height. Church history was now a Polyphemus with his eye put out, to use the figure of Herder. A reaction however commenced, that has continued to the present time, and has resulted in a mass of historical literature possessing a warm and profound sympathy with the doctrines and spirit of Christianity, and founded upon a learned and scientific study of the sources. The labors of *Neander*[4] have contributed to this result, more

---

tiquorum Christianorum statu. Halle 1771. Versuch eines fruchtbaren Auszugs der Kirchengeschichte. Halle 1772. Versuch christlicher Jahrbücher. Halle 1783. Observationes novae (previous to Constantine). Halle 1784. Neuer Versuch (confined to first century) Leipsic 1788.

[1] Christliche Kirchengeschichte. Leipsic 1768–1810. In 45 volumes; the last two a continuation by Tzschirner.

[2] The more important works contemporary with that of Schröckh are: Cramer's Continuation of Bossuet's Universal History; valuable for its investigation of Scholasticism. Walch's History of Heresies; a work characterized by the industry and tediousness of Schröckh. G. J. Planck's Histories of the Protestant doctrine and polity.

[3] Allgemeine Gesch. der Christl. Kirche: edited and continued by Vater. Brunswick 1806–23.

[4] Allgemeine Gesch, der Christl. Religion und Kirche; the last volume edited by Schneider. Hamburgh 1825–1851. Translated by Torrey. Of the works in general church history that follow Neander most closely are: Guericke

than those of any other writer, and make the second epoch in the modern history of the department, those of Mosheim constituting the first. The remains of the old rationalism are seen in the history of *Gieseler;*[1] a work of great value for the fulness and pertinency of its citations from the original sources, but characterized by a feeble power of combination, and a dull indifferent tone in regard to the entire internal history. In the writings of *Baur*, which are confined chiefly to the department of doctrinal history, the pantheistic speculation overmasters a remarkably clear and powerful understanding, and, by the use of an arbitrary criticism, eventually misshapes the materials (which have been collected with great affluence of learning, and combined with symmetry and energy) into an artificial scheme, rather than an organic system.

REFORMED HISTORIANS. Historical investigations in the Reformed churches were directed more to particular parts of the subject, than to the department as a whole. In the 16th and especially in the 17th century, the *French Protestants* produced a series of works distinguished by learning, acuteness, and discrimination, together with an earnest and sharp polemic temper towards the papacy.[2] During the same period the *English* Church was unusually occupied with historical inquiries, and gave origin to a body of literature of solid worth, chiefly in reference however to the external his-

---

Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte, 8th edition, 1854. Kurtz Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte (unfinished).

[1] Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, (translated by Cunningham; also by Davidson and others.) Hase's Kirchengeschichte, 7th edition, 1854, (translated by Blumenthal and Wing) is a tasteful but very brief sketch, from the position of a moderate and serious rationalism. Niedner's Geschichte der Christl. Kirche. Leipsic 1846. The method and nomenclature are cumbrous, but this manual is not surpassed by any in copiousness and density of materials.

[2] The more prominent writers are: Du Plessis Mornay, Pierre du Moulin, Jean Daille (Dallaeus), David Blondel, Saumaise (Salmasius); somewhat later, James and Samuel Basnage, Isaac Beausobre. The *Holland* Church produced a few writers of substantial merits: Spanheim, Vossius the elder, Vitringa, and Venema. The *Swiss* historical writers, Hospinian, Hottinger, and Heidegger, are also worthy of mention.

tory, and with few exceptions characterized by a strong patristic and prelatical bias.[1] The 18th century witnessed a revival of secular history, in the works of *Hume*, *Robertson*, and *Gibbon*, and a decline in ecclesiastical history. The principal English productions in church history during this century, are: the writings of *Lardner* the most learned investigator of the century, relating chiefly to the history of the New Testament canon; the "Remarks" of *Jortin*, fragmentary but reliable investigations upon particular points; *Neale's* History of the Puritans, a most sincere and weighty piece of historical composition; the devout but undiscriminating work of *Milner;* and lastly the voluminous and superficial treatises of *Priestley*, thoroughly refuted by the vigorous and terse tracts of *Horsley*. In the 19th century, the histories of *Waddington* and *Milman* exhibit a decided advance upon the method and spirit of the preceding period; the latter writer, particularly in his interesting History of Latin Christianity, evincing the influence of the Neandrian school.

ROMAN CATHOLIC HISTORIANS. As an answer to the Magdeburg Centuries, *Cæsar Baronius* composed his Annales Ecclesiastici;[2] a voluminous work, and chiefly valuable as a collection of materials. Baronius himself brought down the history of the Church to 1198. His work found several continuators[3] among Roman Catholic theologians, and also some strict critics, both Protestant,[1] and Roman Catholic.[2] In particular departments of Church history several *Italian* writers have produced works of great merit.[3] The excellent *Paul Sarpi*,[4] in the 17th century, composed a history of the Council of Trent, that is of standard value, and causes regret that the author did not labor upon the general history of the Church. In the latter part of the 18th century, some Italian theologians revived the interest in Ecclesiastical history, which had slumbered among them for nearly a hundred years, by the production of voluminous works in general Church history.[5] Among Roman Catholic writers, however, the merits of the *French*[6] historians are the greatest, many of whom, as e. g. *Du Pin*, are distinguished equally with Sarpi for independence and boldness: traits that characterized the Gallican church from the beginning. Among the productions of the French ecclesiastical historians, those of the learned Dominican *Natalis*[7] (*Alexander Noël*), the conscientious Jansenist *Sebastian le Nain de Tillemont*,[8] the versatile and devout *Claude Fleury*,[9] confessor to Louis XV., possess permanent value. The eloquent *Discours sur l'histoire universelle* of *Bossuet*,[10] maintaining the position that Church history is the soul of Universal history, is also worthy of mention. Within the present century a revived interest in Ecclesiastical history arose in the *German*[1] *Catholic Church*, which the recent controversies with Protestantism, however, seem to have checked.

---

[1] Hooker Ecclesiastical Polity. Usher Britannicarum ecclesiarum antiquitates, Annales veteris Testamenti, Dissertt. de epistolis Ignatii et Polycarpi, Historia Gotteschalci, Historia dogmatica, Religion of the Ancient Irish. Stillingfleet Origines Brittannicae. Bull Defensio fidei Nicaenae. Bingham Origines Ecclesiasticae. Cave Lives of the Primitive Fathers, Lives of the Apostles, Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria. Prideaux Connection of Old and New Testaments. Pearson Exposition of the Apostles Creed, Vindiciae Epistolarum Ignatii. Strype Annals. Burnet History of the Reformation. Bower History of the Popes.

[2] Annales Ecclesiastici. Rome 1588–1607. 12 vols., fol.

[3] Of these, the most distinguished is Raynaldus Annal. eccl. T. XIII.–XXI. Rome 1646 sqq., to A. D. 1565. De Laderchius continued this to A. D. 1571. Ann. eccl. T. XXII.–XXIV. Rome 1728. Other continuations are: that of Bzovius Rome 1616., to A. D. 1564; and that of Spondanus Paris 1640., to A. D. 1640. A complete edition of Baronius, Raynaldus, etc., together with Pagi's review, is that of Mansi Lucca 1738–59. 38 vols., fol.

---

[1] Casauboni Exercitationes XVII. de rebus sacris et ecclesiasticis. Lond 1614; continued by Sam. Basnage Exercitatt. cet. Ultraj. 1692.

[2] Ant. Pagi Critica hist. chronologica in annales Baronii, ed. Franc. Pagi Antv. 1705.

[3] T.M. Mamachius, J.D. Mansi, L. A. Muratori, Rob. Bellarmin.

[4] Translated by Brent London, 1620. fol.

[5] Orsi Storia ecclesiastica Rome 1748. 20 vols., folio, containing the history of the first six centuries; continued by Becchetti Rome 1770. 17 vols. (to 1378), and 1788. 9 vols. (to 1550). Sacharelli Hist. Eccles. Rome 1772. 25 vols. (to 1185.)

[6] Petavius De theologicis dogmatibus, 5 vols. Venice 1724: a very valuable work in doctrinal history. Baluzius, Thomassin, Mabillon, Montfaucon, Ceillier, Martene, and others.

[7] Nat. Alexander Historia Ecclesiastica Vet. et. Nov. Test. ed. Mansi Lucca. 1748. 9 vols. fol., (to the end of the 16th century).

[8] Tillemont Memoires etc. (see p. 8).

[9] Cl. Fleury Histoire Ecclesiastique, Paris 1691. 20 vols. (to 1414); continued by Fabre Paris 1726. 6 vols. (to 1595), and by La Croix 1776. 6 vols.

[10] Paris 1681. (from the creation to Charlemagne).

---

[1] Möhler († 1838) Symbolik. Von Stolberg Geschichte der Religion Jesus Christus. Hamburg 1806. 15 vols.; continued by Von Kertz Mainz 1825–44. Vols. 16–40. Katerkamp Kirchengeschichte Münster 1819–34. 5 vols. (to 1150). Hortig Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte, with Dollinger's continuation. Gangauf Metaphysische Psychologie des Augustinus, Augsburg 1852., is a note-worthy production in dogmatic history.

ANCIENT CHURCH HISTORY:

INCLUDING THE FIRST SIX CENTURIES.

FIRST PERIOD: TO A. D., 311.

PART FIRST.

THE FOUNDING OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

CHAPTER FIRST.

RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF THE WORLD, AT THE ADVENT OF CHRIST.

§ 7.

PAGANISM.

Compare Neander Church History, Vol. I. pp. 1–68; Mosheim Commentaries, Vol. I. pp. 9–81; Tholuck Nature and Moral Influence of Heathenism, in Biblical Repository for 1832. . . Creuzer Symbolik. Constant Du polytheism Romain. Hegel Philosophie der Geschichte. Müller Prolegomena zu einer wiss. Mythologie. Brouwer Histoire de la civilization des Grecs. Heeren Researches on Ancient Greece.

1. The religious ideas that lie at the bottom of all pagan religions, sprang originally from divine revelation, either internal or external. Having been darkened by human apostasy, they could not, however, in the distorted form which they now assumed in heathenism, avail to check even the grossest manifestations of unbelief and superstition. Resting upon myths and the vague intimations and feelings of the human soul, the ancient *popular religion of the Greeks and Romans*, in particular, naturally came in conflict with the increasing education and refinement of these highly civilized nations, but could not vanquish the scepticism that was engendered thereby. Hence, notwithstanding the efforts of the government and the patriotic citizen to prop up the declining state-religion, an utter disbelief in everything religious and divine gradually spread among the cultivated and noble classes, and passed over from them into the mass

of society, bringing with it a dreadful corruption of morals and manners. A species of philosophy that set up pleasure as the highest good, and wholly denied the reality of any objective truth, became the prevalent mode of thinking, and if here and there a man of more earnest religious temper felt constrained to resist the godless spirit of his age, in its extreme forms, yet religion even for him lost its vitality, and God himself became the product of the human understanding. But on the other hand, this very unbelief, groping about in vain for a satisfying object, carried the germ of a reaction. Many, with a sense of inward emptiness and a dim intimation of a higher world, despairing of any satisfaction from the various conflicting philosophical systems, yearned after the old religion of their fathers, and boldly grasped it again with glowing zeal. But this was now no longer sufficient, by itself. The barbaric religions of Asia and Egypt must be brought in, to impart a new decoration and interest to the effete ancestral system, and amulets, talismans, and magicians, found a welcome reception. Such was the general state of the religion of the Greeks and Romans, at the time of the advent of the Redeemer. Reckless infidelity and horrible superstition, both alike fostered by the reigning dissoluteness of morals, contended for the mastery, and the great mass of the people lay sunk in absolute godlessness.

2. A deeper religious need was wakened in some few minds, and these sought satisfaction in the two better *philosophical systems* of the time; neither of which however was fitted to meet this immortal longing of the heart. The *Stoic* philosophy, through its ideal of a perfect virtue, could indeed flare a clearer light over the prevailing corruption of morals, but could give no disclosures respecting the unseen world and man's future relations to God. Stoicism, moreover, left its disciples to the isolated strain of their own wills, and bade them find their elysium in this tension. Blindly and coldly they subjected themselves, for life or for death, to the unalterable law of the universe, and sought to find their heaven in this their passionless mood.

The principles of *Platonism* did not, indeed, minister to the self-reliant pride of human nature. On the other hand they tended to produce the sense of dependence upon a higher Power, and to lead men to seek communion therewith, as the only source of enlightenment and moral excellence. But they could only teach them to *seek*, not to find. This consummation could be effected, only by a mediator who "was come from God and went to God." Platonism, in thus hinting at a perfect religion that was itself the substance, while all others were the shadows, and in spiritualizing the popular religions of the time, dimly looked towards Christianity; yet the mass of the people, in whose minds the positive statutes and enforcements of the *government* were associated with the very idea of a religion, could not regard this free intellectual system as a religion at all, and did not understand its speculations; while the select class, whose Platonic eclecticism sought to cull and combine the better elements from all religions, were continually vacillating in their opinions, and finally fell into fanaticism, losing altogether that religious longing which Platonism had awakened but could not still.

§ 8.

JUDAISM.

1. The *religion of the Jews*, originally a pure revelation from heaven, was altogether different from that of the heathen. Divine in its origin and nature, resting upon a series of facts that betokened a constantly miraculous divine guidance, in its law revealing both the holiness of God and the sin of man, by its Messianic promises and its sanctifying influence affording a tranquillizing ground of hope for the restless heart, — Judaism had been given to man as a reddening dawn to the bright day of Christianity; and yet, when at length HE appeared, whom the entire national history of the Jew had prefigured and preannounced — nay, with whose advent the Jewish nationality itself stood not merely in a

prophetic but a causal and organic connection, and for whose visible kingdom the Israelitish Church itself had been designed as the basis and foundation,[1] — this corner stone was rejected by the builders. Misapprehending the spirit of the Old Testament religion, vain-gloriously boasting themselves to be the people of God, utterly blinded as to the cause of the terrible national judgments they were suffering, desiring nothing but deliverance from temporal distresses, hoping greedily for the advent of a Messiah who should free them from the Roman yoke by supernatural power, give *them* the supreme dominion on earth, and dispense all kinds of earthly enjoyment,—the mass of the Jewish nation had converted the divine blessing into a curse, and were rejecting the true Messiah who came in the form of a servant to die for the sin of the world, yet lending a willing ear to the fanatical demagogue,[2] and running blindly to their own destruction, after their deceiving, and half insane, false prophets and Messiahs.[3]

2. The *theology* of the Jews, corresponded with the corrupt condition of their religion. Split into three sects, the pseudo-orthodoxy of the Pharisees, the illuminism of the

---

[1] Compare Delitzsch Die biblisch-prophetische Theologie, Leipsic 1845. S. 131.

[2] Judas of Gamala or Judas Galilaeus, sometimes called Judas Gaulonites, יְהוּדָה הַגַּבְלָנִי, 14 years after the birth of Christ: See Acts v., 37; Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. I. 5.

[3] The following summary contains the history of the *political rulers* of Judea at the time of the advent of Christ. *Herod* the Idumean ruled over the Jewish land, in dependence upon the Romans, from 40–4. B. C. His three sons succeeded him: *Archelaus* as ethnarch in Judea, Samaria, and Idumea; *Philip* as tetrarch in Batanea, Ituraea, and Trachonitis; and *Herod Antipas* as tetrarch in Galilee, and Peraea. After the banishment of *Archelaus*, A. D. 6., his territories became a Roman province which was governed, under the procurator of Syria, by a proconsul: Pontius Pilate, the fifth in the series, ruling from 28–37. A. D. After *Philip's* death, which occurred A. D. 34, his territory, after remaining a Roman province three years, was then consigned to Herod Agrippa I. This prince united it with the tetrarchy of *Herod Antipas*, who was banished A. D. 39, and was made king of all Palestine, A. D. 41, by the emperor Claudius. After his death, A. D. 44, his entire kingdom again became a Roman province, and was governed by procurators. On the death of his son, Agrippa II., who in the year 52 had obtained the tetrarchy of Philip, the whole line of Herod became extinct, A. D. 100. See Jost's Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Maccabäer.

Sadducees, and the mysticism of the Essenes, represented three equally false modes of thought, and evinced the utter decay of all true religious science in the nation. The *Pharisees*,[1] the most distinguished and influential class of Jewish theologians, held a speculative system that was compounded of Jewish, Oriental, and especially Persian doctrines, and which by an allegorizing interpretation they pretended to find in the Old Testament. With this they connected a complicated ceremonial, by the exact observance of which, together with petty ascetic practices and mortifications, they supposed they more than merited the favor of God; especially in case this observance was accompanied with moral earnestness, and was not as with the majority a mere pretence. The bitter opponents of the Pharisees, were the *Sadducees*,[2] a smaller body, composed chiefly of men living in the easy enjoyment of wealth, whose aspirations went no farther than an earthly good, and whose highest moral aim was the upright life of the citizen. Their religious creed was confined to the mere letter of the Pentateuch, and contained only such tenets as they deemed to be explicitly taught in it; and hence they rejected, though with something of caution, the doctrines of the soul's immortality, the resurrection of the body, the existence of an angelic world, and a particular providence. The *Essaënes*, or *Essenes*,[3] were a society of men who had withdrawn into solitude from this conflict of parties, in order to lead a religious life in silent contemplation. The place of their first retreat was probably the west coast of the Dead Sea, but proceeding from this region they afterwards established themselves at many other points in Palestine, devoting themselves chiefly to agriculture and medicine, and being generally esteemed for their inoffensive manner of life. Their distinguishing characteristic was a decided aversion to the externals of religion, and a tendency towards its inward life, united with an endeavor not to live for themselves alone; yet the trustworthy account of this sect given by Josephus,[1] proves plainly that their religious striving was by no means a purely spiritual one, and that their subjective mysticism was, as usual, mixed more or less with selfishness and pride. The superstitious estimate which they placed upon many outward usages, the oath, taken by the neophyte after a three years' novitiate, to keep secret the name of their guardian angel, the entire rejection of the oath *except in this instance*, and the precise minutiae of their code of regulations, all evince how slight was their religious earnestness, and how little they hungered and thirsted after the righteousness that is valid before God.[2]

---

[1] From פָּרַשׁ, to separate; on the ground of superior sanctity. The Talmud so explains the name פְּרוּשִׁים, and the lexicographers and commentators coincide with this explanation. See Talmud. Babylon. Chagiga f. 18, 6; and Nathan in his Lex. Aruch.

[2] Epiphanius derives the name of this sect from the appellative צַדִּיק. It is more probable however that it took its name from Zadock, the fellow disciple of Boëthos (בויתוס), both of whom were disciples of Antigonus of Socho. The Sadducees are denominated in the Talmud צַדּוּקִים or צַדּוּקִין, sometimes also בויתוסין, since both Zadock and Boëthus, conjointly, founded the new sect. See Sievert de Sadducaeis. Grossmann de philosophia Sadducaeorum; de fragmentis Sadducaeorum exegeticis; de statu eorum, literario, morali, et politico.

[3] Some would derive the name from the Syrian ܐܣܐ, *to heal*, or from the Chaldean אָסֵי, *a physician*. It has, however, been satisfactorily proved to be a modification of חֲסִידִים (*ὅσιοι*), the name given to the Essenes in the Talmud. The conjecture is not undeserving of notice which connects the Essenes with the later

---

Soharites. See Pleszner Jüdisch-Mosaischer Religionsunterricht S. 47. XX. Delitzsch Geschichte der Jüdischen Poësie S. 25.

[1] *Flavius Josephus*, born 37. died 93. A. D., the Jewish general in Galilee, taken captive in the Jewish War in Vespasian's reign, the author of a history in 20 books of the Jewish Nation and Antiquities, of an account of the Jewish War in Vespasian's reign in 7 books, of a defence of Judaism against Apion in 2 books, together with a sketch of his own life, is a more trustworthy witness respecting the Essenes, than *Philo*, who gives an ideal sketch of them in his work: Quod omnis probus liber. Josephus was the more unbiassed mind of the two, and had moreover as a native inhabitant of the Palestine lived a long time among the Essenes.

[2] In the region about Alexandria, by Lake Moeris, dwelt the *Therapeutae* (from *θεραπεύειν*, to denote uncommon devotion to God); a sect similar to the *Essenes*, and which most probably originated in that same tendency towards theosophy and mysticism, which had now united itself with Judaism. Shut up in their cells (*μοναστηριοις* and *σεμνειοις*), and assembling only on each sabbath at a single meal, and on every seventh sabbath for certain mystic solemnities, they led a more contemplative, less practical, and more strictly ascetic, life than the *Essenes.* See Sauer de Essenis et Therapeutis disquisitio.

3. The *Jews of Alexandria*, in which city very many had settled under the protection of the Ptolemies, were characterized by a peculiar spirit and bent that distinguished them from the mass of their countrymen. In order to defend their religion in this flourishing seat of Grecian literature, from the sneers of the cultivated, they deemed it necessary to occupy the same point of view with the educated Grecian. Forming a strong predilection for the reigning Platonic philosophy, and becoming too much estranged from their own national modes of thought, under pretence of a deeper penetration into the meaning of Scripture they carried over Platonic ideas into the Old Testament, by an allegorizing method of interpretation that found favor also with the Greeks. Thus there were formed among the learned Jews at Alexandria two classes of idealists, who, under the pretence of taking a more profound and spiritual view of the Old Testament, in reality emptied the great divine facts of Biblical history of their meaning. The first were the moderate class, who considered both the historical facts, and the letter of Scripture, to be only the symbolical envelope of universal philosophical truths, the scientific knowledge of which, was the γνῶσις to which the "perfect" were called to aspire, while at the same time they endeavored to hold both the historical facts and the letter of religion as much as possible in respect. The second class were the extreme idealists, who arrayed their esoteric γνῶσις in the strongest possible opposition to the popular Jewish religion, and gave themselves no concern about either the letter, the history, or the externals. All these Alexandrine Jews were, in one respect, better prepared to receive the spiritual system of the gospel, than were the Palestine Jews, whose expectations of a political Messiah they did not share; but, on the other hand, their haughty idealism easily produced a mental self-sufficiency and self-satisfaction that closed their hearts against the gospel, especially when taken in connection with the sluggishness of their Messianic feeling. The spirit of the Alexandrine Jews is clearly reflected in *Philo*.[1]

---

[1] The numerous and generally very brief tracts of the learned (though not in

§ 9.

RELATIONS OF HEATHENISM AND JUDAISM TO CHRISTIANITY.

It is evident from this survey, that Christianity could not *originate* in any of the intellectual or moral tendencies of either Judaism or Paganism. Neither the idolatrous and godless religions of Heathenism, nor a self-ignorant, dead, and formal, Judaism; neither Stoicism gendering only pride and self-reliance, nor Platonism awakening but not satisfying aspirations; neither the rigid and formal pseudo-orthodoxy of the Pharisees, nor the sensual and worldly unbelief of the Sadducees; neither the sectarian mysticism of the Essenes and Therapeutae, nor the wisdom-seeking idealism of the Alexandrine Jews; neither one nor all of these, could give origin to a principle of religious life, which, like the Christian, should satisfy all the moral and religious wants of men, and knit them together in love. And yet this hopeless religious condition of the Pagan and Jewish world, was a *negative preparation* for the appearance and spread of Christianity. This manifest conflict between the different intellectual and religious tendencies of the age, together with the unsatisfying nature of all then existing religious systems, had wakened in many minds a vivid yearning after a peace-giving religion. And when such a religion was revealed, in the person and work of the Son of God, its easy and rapid spread was facilitated by the vast unity of the Roman empire, combining in one whole the most diverse and distant nations; and more

---

Jewish lore) Alexandrine Jew *Philo*, who died about 40 A. D., have been best edited by Mangey. London 1742; (translated in Bohn's Library.) Also see, Dähne Bemerkungen über die Schriften des Juden Philo, Studien und Kritiken 1833; Grossmann De Philonis Judei operum continua serie ex ordine chronologica. Respecting Philo's system compare Neander Church History I. 44 et seq; Gfrörer Philo und die Alexandrinische Theosophie, particularly Part I; Dorner Person Christi Theil I. Abth. 1; Grossmann Quaestiones Philonae. Upon this Alexandrine tendency generally, see Dähne Geschichtliche Darstellung der Jüd.-Alexandrin. Religionsphilosophie.

particularly by the great number of Jewish colonists, by whom the knowledge of the new doctrine was carried from Jerusalem into all the countries of the known world. In addition to these favoring circumstances, Judaism itself, becoming missionary in its spirit, had introduced into its communion great numbers of *proselytes* from heathenism. Of these, the completely initiated *proselytes of righteousness* (גֵּרֵי צֶדֶק) were the worst enemies of the gospel, being even more malignant than the native Jew. But on the other hand, the *proselytes of the gate* (גֵּרֵי שַׁעַר), styled in the New Testament *φοβούμενοι* and *σεβόμενοι τόν ϑεόν,* uninfected with the ceremonial formalism and political fanaticism of the Jewish people, acknowledging with heart-felt conviction the one God of the Old Testament, resting upon his consolatory promises in this earlier revelation, and humbly seeking a yet clearer illumination, readily received the Gospel, and became the most efficient instruments of its diffusion among the heathen.

CHAPTER SECOND.

JESUS CHRIST.

Gerhard De vita et resurrectione Christi. 1652. Vossius De vita et morte Christi. Reinhardt Versuch über den Plan Jesu; translated by Taylor. Neander Leben Jesu; translated by McClintock. Tholuck Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelische Geschichte. Ullmann Die Sündlosigkeit Jesu; translated by Park. Stier Die Reden Jesu; translated by Pope. Trench The Parables and Miracles of Our Lord. Edwards History of Redemption. Period II. Parts I. II. Olshausen Commentary in locis. Paulus Leben Jesu. 1828. (rationalistic). Strausz Leben Jesu. (mythical theory). Gfrörer Geschichte des Urchristenthum. Hase Leben Jesu. 3d ed. 1840; valuable as a collection of materials.

§ 10.

THE NEW TESTAMENT VIEW OF THE PERSON AND WORK OF CHRIST.

The Scriptures recognize in man a nature originally kindred to the Divine. Since the disobedience of the first pair, this image of God no longer exists in its primitive power and purity, but in accordance with that law of development under which the human race was created, the principle of self-will and sin unfolds and reigns responsibly in all men, notwithstanding the resistance of conscience, and the faint aspirations of an immortal spirit not yet reprobated. The consciousness of this internal schism, is the ground and substance of human misery. Inward sin and guilt testify to man of his estrangement from God, and of the holy wrath abiding upon him, and he has now neither the disposition nor the power to tear away from himself and turn to God alone. The utmost to which he is competent, under the natural workings of his own mind and the common influences of the Divine Spirit, is a sense of wretchedness, and a desire for peace. This is the deeply seated consciousness of the need of redemption, becoming clearer and louder in every man, the more he strives to satisfy and obey that righteous law which *requires* instantaneous and absolute perfection, but imparts no power to fulfil the requisition. Upon this sense of the need of redemption, dim and dark in the pagan world, rests that vague expectation of a Deliverer which runs through the better heathen theologies; and upon this same consciousness, made painfully vivid and distinct by the fuller revelation and application of law, rests the clear and great Old Testament idea of the *Messiah.*

Jesus Christ distinctly declared himself to be this Messiah,[1] promised to the Jews in the Old Testament, and vaguely hoped for in the Pagan consciousness as the "desire of all nations."[2] In so doing, he announced himself to be that central Personage in human history, to whom all the past had looked forward, and all the future would look backward. At the same time, he both contradicted and corrected the prevalent Jewish idea of the Messiah. The Jews, grossly misapprehending the prophetic descriptions of the Old Testament, were expecting in this Personage only an eminently wise and good *man*, who was to be suddenly and unexpectedly consecrated to his Messianic office by the prophet Elias, and endued with divine power, in order to deliver the Jews from a foreign yoke, inflict judgments upon the heathen, and establish a triumphant earthly kingdom, whose members, the worshippers of the national Jehovah, should enjoy every species of earthly felicity. From this misapprehension, even many of the first Christian believers were not entirely free; the political national feeling being somewhat mingled with their sense of religious need, and incipient faith. The idea of the Messiah was however grasped in its pure spirituality, by a few of the contemporaries of Christ; such as a *Zacharias* and a *Simeon*, who were also favored with moments of special divine illumination;[1] and in still greater purity and power by *John the Baptist*, the immediate forerunner of the Messiah, and the connecting link between the old and new economies. But the idea obtained its full and complete enunciation only in the teachings of Christ himself, who distinctly announced that his kingdom is not of this world, and, in the face of Jewish opposition and charges of blasphemy, gave plain and unambiguous testimony to his own *divine nature and dignity*, as the only-begotten Son of the eternal God.

---

[1] See Matthew, chapter xxi; xvi, 16. 17; xxvi, 64; xxvii, 11.

[2] Haggai, ii, 7.

He in whom dwelt the entire fulness of the divine essence, out of love to the fallen human race became and was *truly man*. As such he lived among men; sinless, though temptable, and actually tempted by Satan; in possession of all human feelings and sympathies, though these were perfectly sanctified by the constant and inmost blending of the divine with the human in his Person. His *whole earthly life* was a continuous manifestation of that ineffable *union of Deity and humanity*, which was indicated by his miraculous birth, announced at his baptism, and made visible on the mount of transfiguration. In relation to this one great continual miracle of his existence, all his *single and particular acts of miraculous power* appear both homogeneous and natural; being never exerted with magical abruptness, for their own sake, but always in closest connection with wisdom and love, and for the attainment of moral and spiritual ends.

?/wd

The earthly and visible activity of Christ was terminated by his *death*, the deepest and most stupendous wonder in the history of the Son of God and man. This event was followed by his *resurrection* from the dead, the consequences of which prove its reality, and the accompanying circumstances its supernatural character. The resurrection of Christ, in connection with his *ascension*, constituted the point of transition, from his earthly life of humiliation, to a higher state, in which his divinity, no longer held in abeyance, manifests itself in its infinite fulness of power in his human nature still forever united with it, and becomes the pledge to his people of their eternal redemption from sin, death, and the dominion of Satan, and to all mankind of his *final advent*, in majesty, as their judge.

---

[1] Luke, chapters i. ii.

This exalted Personage delineated in his *doctrine* the absolute ideal of holiness, as no other teacher has done, and he alone, of all, perfectly realized it in *life*. But the contemplation of this ideal, alone and by itself, serves only to produce a clearer knowledge of personal sinfulness, and a more poignant sense of guilt, and consequently can never work out a deliverance from either. Hence Christ was not merely or mainly a teacher and exemplar. He was primarily a *Redeemer*. His whole appearance on earth, was the substance and accomplishment of a redemptive plan, that involved the revelation and conciliation of both the justice and the mercy of God. That which Christ did and suffered, was not for himself but for humanity; in their stead and for their salvation. His *sufferings and death*, in particular, are the objective fact upon which the forgiveness of man's sin rests. Such an objective ground of pardon was necessary: on the side of God, that the immanent attribute of justice in the divine nature might be satisfied; on the part of man, that the conscience might be pacified, and the despairing spirit have a sure pledge that there is mercy in the heavens. The sinless God-Man voluntarily endured a passion that was an absolute satisfaction of eternal justice for the sin of the world. In this fact, the infinite love and compassion of the Triune God towards the ill-deserving creature are manifested in their most wonderful and moving aspect; being seen in the form of a *self*-sacrifice for his salvation.

? / doctr.

"

The person and work of Christ are thus the source and centre of a new *life* for humanity, and not merely of a new truth. For this objective fact of Redemption, is a living and life-giving one. When, through the inward influences of the *Holy Ghost*, dispensed in connection with the work of the *Son*, repentance and faith are wrought in the soul, the plenary satisfaction of the divine attribute by the divine substitute becomes the appropriated and vital possession of the human criminal, and the ideal of holiness, realized in the life of Christ, progressively becomes the inward character of the regenerated spirit.

§ 11.

SKETCH OF THE EARTHLY LIFE OF CHRIST.

The attempt has been made, in modern times, to convert the entire human history of Jesus Christ into an insignificant and unimportant myth. This mythical mode of explanation rests, however, solely upon subjective hypotheses: such, for example, as that of an idealizing tendency in the apostolic churches; of the spuriousness of the four gospels; of their essential discrepancy; of the extravagance of oriental fancy; of the self-deception or dishonesty of Christ himself; and of the inconceivability of the Supernatural. The only basis of an unbiassed and objective view of the life of Jesus, is the historical one given in the four canonical gospels; of which the genuineness is both critically and historically demonstrable, while their contents themselves, taken in connection and comparison with those of the apocryphal gospels, furnish strong evidence of their truthfulness as statements of actual occurrences.

After the promise of the Messiah had been announced with ever increasing distinctness in the Old Testament revelation, it found its fulfilment, preceded and accompanied by circumstances of the most remarkably supernatural character, at Bethlehem, a place long before indicated in prophecy in connection with this event. Jesus Christ was born of the Israelite Virgin Mary, who belonged to the family of David;[1] as did also Joseph, who, having been betrothed to her previous to her miraculous conception, afterwards become her legal husband for her protection from reproach. By a miracle, necessarily above that ordinary course of development through which the individuals of the human race are born, the Redeemer of humanity was really, but immaculately, born into the world of human beings, and the angelic world — for there is no dead mechanism in the living universe of God, — solemnized the birth. Led by the providence of God, which condescended to the need of the age and the information of individuals, and following those Messianic hopes and intimations which were current even in the pagan world, Magi from the East offered their worship to the newborn Messiah: the first announcement that Christ is also the Redeemer of the Gentiles. The infancy of Jesus was not spent in the parental home, but in a flight to Egypt, to escape from that bloody cruelty of Herod of which the whole after history of this tyrant gives such abundant testimony. On the return from Egypt, Joseph, with Mary, took up his abode in Nazareth his former residence, and within the territory of the more humane Herod Antipas. The human individuality of Jesus now unfolded within a family circle that consisted, besides his mother and his foster-father whose trade he seems to have followed, of a number of *ἀδελφοὶ* and *ἀδελφαὶ* of Jesus: in all probability, either cousins of Jesus on the side of Mary, or children of Joseph by a former marriage.[1] Only a single feature from the history of the youth of Christ has been preserved, by Luke, in the account of the conversation of the child of twelve years with the doctors in the temple: a lineament full of meaning, and throwing a characteristic light upon his human mental development. The reading of the Old Testament unfolded the Messianic consciousness, in Christ, in a natural and spontaneous manner, while yet the higher illumination, which proceeded from the union of Deity with humanity in his Person, resulted in a religious knowledge beyond that of a mere teacher of the Jewish law, or even of an inspired prophet of the old economy, and incapable of being referred to any of the particular theological schools of the nation. At length, in the thirtieth year of his age, Jesus Christ appeared publicly as the Messiah. *John the Baptist*, standing upon the threshold of the new dispensation and at the close of the Old Testament economy, announced his advent.[1] In the desert country of Judea near the Jordan, practising the rigid austerity of the Nazarite, John appeared as a public teacher in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, and called upon his countrymen to prepare themselves, by repentance for sin and reception of baptism as a symbol of a changed mood, to enter into the Messianic kingdom, now on the point of being established. The whole moral life of the people was deeply stirred. Jesus also came to be baptized; not indeed with the penitent feeling of the people, or to obtain something of which he was himself destitute, but to receive a formal consecration to his Messianic office and work, from him who had been called to announce the near approach of the Messianic kingdom, and, more particularly, to be solemnly accredited to the Baptist himself as the incarnate Son of God.[2] After this event John continued in his appointed work, willingly and gladly decreasing while Christ increased, and divinely enlightened respecting the *general* nature and aim of the new spiritual kingdom which he prophetically knew would be founded upon the sufferings of the "Lamb of God;" though not able to see the mystery of redemption in all its fulness of meaning,[3] before the death of Christ had actually occurred, and the agency of the Holy Spirit had been dispensed to the church. The time had now come for Christ himself to commence *his* great work. In the narrative of the evangelists, the period of Christ's preparation for his public work closes with his temptation in the wilderness: a victorious conflict in which the entire history of his life and kingdom is shadowed forth. By reason of the sinlessness of the subject, the temptation, as in the previous instance of the unfallen Adam, must come wholly from without. Satan seeks to seduce the Redeemer into the common apostasy of mankind, by a threefold temptation appealing to bodily appetite, love of distinction, and love of worldly possessions; but with no other result than the most convincing proof, that the tempted personage was the Son of God, and completely qualified to be a deliverer from sin and Satan. Christ's entrance upon his public ministry and redeeming work, follows this personal triumph over the kingdom of evil. The testimony of John the Baptist conducted his first disciples to him, whom he now caused to be the constant eye-witnesses of those supernatural agencies which he exerted through his entire public life, as the tokens of his divinity; flashes, as it were, of that veiled deity and glory which was permitted to display itself in all its fulness of splendor, upon only a single occasion, on the mount of transfiguration. Teaching, and bestowing blessings wherever he went, he yet confined his public work almost entirely to the land of his countrymen; offering salvation first to the Jews, from whence it was to pass over to all mankind.[1] But the envy and hatred of the pharisaical Jews, whose carnal and contemptuous mind totally misapprehended the Old Testament promise of a Messiah, increased with every one of the few years of Christ's public ministry. Shortly before the last passover he spent upon earth, Jesus went up to Jerusalem for the last time, and made a solemn entry into the sacred city, in order to testify, by an act of mingled humility and regal dignity, that he was the promised and commissioned Redeemer of the world.

---

[1] *Luke* gives the genealogy of Mary, the natural mother of Jesus; *Matthew* that of Joseph, the legal and reputed father. See Wieseler Studien u. Kritiken 1845. Heft. 2, S. 361. Also see Delitzsch Die biblisch. proph. Theologie S. 86.

---

[1] If by "brethren" and "sisters" are denoted children of Mary herself, it is difficult to account for Christ's commending Mary to the care of John. The epithet "first born" is not decisive, for among the Jews it would have its emphatic force even when there was but one son.

---

[1] John the Baptist the son of Zacharias and Elizabeth was a relative of Jesus, and born only six months before him. See Bax de Joh. Baptista; Leopold Johann der Täufer.

[2] See John i. 31–34.

[3] See Matthew xi. 2–15.

---

[1] That the work of the Messiah was to avail for all humanity, and not solely for the Jews, is plainly taught in Isaiah and other parts of the Old Testament. And yet that people whom God had chosen from the beginning must be the central point of radiation; particularly through the *Jewish* birth of the mysterious Personage himself. Hence we find the theatre of Christ's work to be Galilee and Judea. He passed through Samaria once, and only once do we find him out of Jewish territory. See Mark vii. 24–30.

By the avarice of one of his disciples, delivered up to the malice of his enemies, from whom he *would* not escape, he yet keeps the passover with his disciples at the beginning of his voluntary passion, instituting at the same time the sacrament of the Supper, as the constant memorial of his expiatory death, and the standing pledge of his communion with his church. On the same night he passes through the bitter preparatory conflict of Gethsemane, is then taken prisoner by the band of the traitor, and, after being deserted and denied by his dearest friends, is condemned to death, by both the Jewish high priest and the Roman proconsul, the characterless Pilate—by the former as the only-begotten Son of God, by the latter as a King, — by both, therefore, as the Messiah and Redeemer of mankind. In his death he finished the work of expiating human guilt. On the third day, as he foretold, he rose from the dead. Though immediately acknowledged in the heavens as the conqueror of sin and death, he yet chose only a few, from among those whose faith fitted them for such a function, to be witnesses on earth of this miracle, reserving the full demonstration of the great fact, for the final winding-up of human history. With the most vivid simplicity, all the eye-witnesses vie with each other in reproducing the great event of the resurrection, in all its minutest features. Out of condescending love still tarrying forty days here below, as it were on the border line between the states of mundane existence and supra-mundane exaltation, Jesus Christ finally departed from his disciples in the act of ascension; the necessary sequence and consequence of his far more wonderful resurrection, yet expressly testified to, not merely by Mark and Luke, but also by the apostles and actual eye-witnesses themselves.[1] He departed, however, not to separate himself from his followers, but that he might henceforth be with them, by a more efficient spiritual presence, to the end of the world, as the Lord and Head of the Church, his redeemed.

---

[1] By *Matthew* xxvi. 64. By *John* iii. 13; vi. 52, 62; xx. 17. Also by both evangelists in their accounts of Christ after his resurrection. Likewise by *Peter* 1 Pet. iii. 22; and Acts ii. 33; v. 31.

HISTORICO-CRITICAL PARTICULARS RELATING TO THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

1. *Chronological Data.* The *birth-day* of Jesus cannot be determined with certainty. According to Clemens Alexandrinus, Stromata I. p. 340, some contended for the 25th of Pachon (May 20th) as the day of his birth, and others for the 24th or 25th of Pharmuthi (Apr. 19th or 20th). Somewhat later, the 6th of January was observed, and afterwards, and more generally, the 25th of December (Sulpic. Sev. Hist. Sac. II. 27). Epiphanius (Expos. Fidei c. 22: Haer. II. c. 29) affirms that the birth of Christ occurred on the 6th of January, which Jerome (Com. in Ezech. 1) denies. Augustine (Ep. 118, 119; Serm. 380) asserts that the Church, by common consent, held the festival of Christ's birth on December 25th.

As the *birth-year* of Christ, Christendom adopts the *aera Dionysiana*, calculated by Dionysius Exiguus in the 6th century, made more generally known by Bede, and employed in public documents by Pepin and Charlemagne. This assumes Christ's birth to have occurred in the year 754 U. C.; making use, as a point of reckoning, of the time of the advent of John the Baptist given in Luke iii. 1. This date, however, is 3 or 4 years too late, for Christ, according to Matthew ii. 1, 19, was born some time, though very shortly, previous to the death of Herod the Great; but Herod died 751 U. C. The best informed of the early fathers designate the year 752 U. C. as the year of Christ's birth: See Irenaeus Adv. Haer. III. 25; Tertullian Adv. Judd. c. 8; Clem. Alex. Strom. I. p. 339; Epiphanius Haer. LI. 22.

The date of Christ's *death* is also uncertain. According to Luke iii. 1 compared with verse 23, Jesus commenced his public ministry about the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius, and in the 30th year of his age. He died on the cross, after he had kept, during his ministry, at least three and and probably four passovers; consequently his ministry was at least more than two, and probably more than three, years in duration. See John ii. 13; vi. 4; xi. 55; v. 1. The three synoptical gospels distinctly mention Christ's presence at Jerusalem at only one passover; and this the last and most important one, when he made his public entry into the city. Chronological and local data came more within the design of the writer of the fourth gospel, as supplementary to the first three. According to all the Roman ecclesiastical writers of the first five centuries, the date of Christ's death falls within the consulate of the two Gemini, C. Rubellius and C. Fufius; i. e. in the year 782 U. C.: See Tertull. Adv. Jud. 8; Aug. De Civitate Dei XVIII. 54; De Trin. IV. 5; Lactant. Inst. IV. 10.

2. *Pretended writings of Christ.* Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. I. 13.) mentions a correspondence, said to have been found in the archives of the church at Edessa, translated from the Syriac into Greek, between Christ and Abgarus king of Edessa. According to this document, Abgarus during a severe sickness addresses a letter to Christ beseeching him to come and heal him; to

which Christ answers that he cannot come, but that after his ascension he will send one of his disciples to him. The letter of Christ appears to be made up of New Testament expressions, while that of Abgarus is not in the style of an oriental royal letter.

3. *Contemporaneous notices of Christ by profane writers.* The most important is that by Josephus, Antiq. XVIII. 3, 3. It is as follows: as quoted also by Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. I. 11, and Demonstr. Ev. III. 5. "At this time appeared Jesus, a wise man, [if indeed he may be called a man; for] he performed wonderful works, [he was a teacher of those who willingly received the truth,] and he gained over to his doctrine many of the Jews and Gentiles. [He was the Christ.] After Pilate, on the ground of the accusation of the chief men among us, had condemned him to the death of the cross, those who had first attached themselves to him did not cease their attachment; for he appeared alive again to them after three days, [as the divine prophets had foretold this, and many other wonderful things, of him.] The class of men who after him are called Christians, still exist to this day."

That this passage, as an entire whole, could not have been interpolated by one of the early Christians, is apparent from the fact that it says so little. It is found, moreover, in all the manuscripts of Josephus and Eusebius; not to mention that a total silence on the part of Josephus respecting the career of Christ is hardly conceivable. But, on the other hand, the fact that Josephus, notwithstanding all his eclecticism, was and continued to be a Jew, and had such a low idea of the Messiah as to regard the prophecies of the Old Testament as intimations that a mighty King was to proceed from Palestine, and applied them to Vespasian (De Bello Jud. VI. 5, 4), renders it questionable whether the passage has not received interpolation to some such extent as is indicated by the brackets.[1]

4. *Pretended contemporaneous accounts of the life of Jesus.* Of these, the most remarkable are the two *Epistolae Pilati ad Tiberium*,[2] which briefly, and generally in a Christian tone, recite the incidents of Christ's life. To these may be added the more diffuse, ʼΑναφορὰ Πιλάτου περι ʼΙησοῦ Χριστοῦ.[3]

The *apocryphal gospels*, contain yet more minute, and more evidently apocryphal, accounts of Jesus and his kindred. They are the product of a taste not satisfied with the severe simplicity and plainness of the canonical gospels, and also of that wonder-seeking tendency which arose in the century immediately succeeding the apostolic age. They are, for the most part, of unknown and heretical origin. The following are the principal of them.

a. The Greek *Protevangelium Jacobi* (Thilo. Codex Apoc. p. 161–273), the oldest and most esteemed of the apocryphal gospels, is, as Origen suggests, the product perhaps of the 2nd century, certainly of the 3rd. The principal part of the work contains an account of the childhood and youth of Mary, to the birth of Jesus inclusively; then follows briefly, and in the phraseology of the canonical gospels, the narrative of the visit of the Magi and the flight into Egypt, concluding with a detailed account of the violent death of the father of John the Baptist. The book relates not a little, certainly, that is credible, and as a whole is less fabulous, and simpler in tone and style, than the apocryphal literature generally. Much of it agrees with corresponding narratives in Justin Martyr and Clemens Alexandrinus; evincing the existence at this period of a common body of tradition pertaining to these subjects. According to this Protevangelium (Chap. 4), Mary, contrary to the later papal doctrine of the *immaculate conception*, was the fruit of the previously childless marriage of Joachim and Anna, late in life; at the age of three years, by the choice of her parents, she was sent to the temple to be trained up in the ceremonial service; at the age of twelve years, as one of the maidens of the temple, she was assigned to Joseph as her guardian; in her fifteenth year she became the mother of the Redeemer. These are particulars that re-appear in all the other apocryphal gospels, and which the 3rd section of the Koran has likewise copied. The Western church made no use of this Protevangelium; though it obtained a wide currency in the Greek and Oriental churches, and was frequently read on festival days, particularly those of the Virgin Mary. The fathers attribute its authorship to "a certain James," and in the work itself (C. 25) a James at Jerusalem speaks of himself; in which specification later tradition would definitely find the *ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου.*

---

[1] See the authorities for, and against, the genuineness, in Gieseler's Church History. Vol. I. § 24. Note 1.

[2] Thilo Codex Apocryphus N. T. P. I. p. 796–802.

[3] Thilo Codex Apoc. N. T. P. I. p. 803 et seq.

b. The Greek *Evangelium Thomae* (Thilo. Codex Apoc. p. 277–315) is one of the most extravagant of the apocryphal gospels. Its character indicates unmistakably a Gnostic origin, and it was highly esteemed by the Manichaeans. It purports to give an account of the childhood and youth of Jesus, from his 5th to his 12th year, and narrates a multitude of partly offensive, and partly silly and mischievous, miracles. Origen mentions this work in his Homil. 1. in Lucam; unless another of the same name is intended.

c. The Greek *Evangelium Nicodemi* (Thilo. p. 489–795), the next in importance after the Protevangelium, consists of two heterogeneous parts; the first a prolix specification of particulars relating to the trial, crucifixion, and resurrection of Jesus; the last a fanciful account of his descent into hell. Both parts are probably of Jewish, or Jewish-Christian origin; having an apologetic aim with reference to the Jews. The first part may be regarded as an expansion of the *Epistolae Pilati*, and undoubtedly has more or less of a historical foundation. The work in its present form, though purporting to be the production of Nicodemus in the time of Christ, could scarcely have been composed before the 5th century. It was highly esteemed in the Western church, during the latter part of the Mediaeval period.

d. The Arabic *Historia Josephi fabri lignarii* (Thilo. p. 3–61) is a work, perhaps of the 4th century, of an author acquainted with Jewish ideas. It describes, in a somewhat homiletic tone, the life and particularly the death

BRITISH ISLES NAZARENE COLLEGE LIBRARY
5719

of the foster-father of Christ. The narrative is full of marvels, and evidently founded upon the Protevangelium.

e. The Arabic *Evangelium Infantis Servatoris* (Thilo. p. 65–131), consisting of loosely connected materials, perhaps a work of the 5th century and of Nestorian origin, relates the life of Jesus from his birth to his twelfth year,—partly on the foundation of the narrative in the *Evangelium Thomae* and with special reference to the exaltation of Mary,—in a fabulous, sometimes childish, and even obscene manner.

f. The latest of the apocryphal gospels are the two Latin ones; since the spirit of the Western church, up to the 6th century, was decidedly opposed to the apocryphal literature of the East. The *Evangelium de Nativitate Mariae* (Thilo. p. 319–336), is an extract, substantially, from the *Protevangelium*. The *Historia de nativitate Mariae et de infantia Salvatoris* (Thilo. p. 339–400), copies the preceding, at first, but concludes with materials from the Arabic *Evangelium Infantis*.

It is obvious that these apocryphal gospels contain, by implication and contrast, a very powerful internal argument for the genuineness and authenticity of the canonical gospels: the existence of the counterfeit being inexplicable except on the hypothesis of that of the genuine object.

CHAPTER THIRD.

FIRST APPEARING OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

§ 12.

PENTECOSTAL EFFUSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The history of the distinctively *Christian* Church commences with the first great act of the risen and glorified Redeemer: the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost.

Christ had repeatedly promised his disciples the Holy Spirit, who would conduct them to a full apprehension of the nature of his redeeming work, and transform their own inward life. He left them, at his ascension, firm in the confidence, on the ground of this promise, that through their own weak instrumentality the word of the Lord would be diffused through the earth as a renovating power. With the first great manifestation of the Holy Spirit, to which all the preceding and comparatively fragmentary dispensations of divine influence had looked, the Christian Church, as distinguished from the Patriarchal and Jewish, came into existence, henceforth, through the bond of this its organizing spirit, to unite all its true members into one body of which Christ is the head. On the sabbath, fifty days after the resurrection of the Lord, and ten days after his ascension, assembled with one accord at Jerusalem, on the occasion of the Jewish feast of Pentecost, (when the first fruits of the wheat harvest were offered, and the anniversary, according to an old tradition of the synagogue, of the giving of the law on Sinai,) the disciples were filled with the Holy Ghost, and the new church of the gospel made its first appearance in the offering of its first fruits. Attended by extraordinary facts in the external world, that vividly typified the glorious occurrences in the internal world of the spirit, and by which the Supernatural betokened its domination over both nature and the human soul enslaved to nature, and, in particular, accompanied by the wonderful sign of speaking in foreign tongues, indicating that every human language was to be consecrated to the proclamation of the gospel, the first special and mighty outpouring of the Holy Ghost, by the glorified Redeemer, took place. The dispensation of the Spirit now commenced, and an influence began to be exerted upon humanity which has ever since evinced its divine and supernatural quality, by the regeneration of the individual soul, and the restoration within it of the divine image and likeness: the highest and most transcendent fact in the history of the human soul since its apostasy and fall. The disciples, previously full of prejudices, fickle, and timid, now speak from the overmastering consciousness of the truth that has made them free, henceforth, with a courage invincible by danger or death, preach the doctrine of faith in the Crucified "whom God hath made both Lord and Christ," and on the same day three thousand souls gladly received the word, and were baptized, who "continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers, praising God and having favor with all the people. And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved."[1]

SPEAKING WITH TONGUES.

There has been much controversy, whether by the phrase "speaking with tongues" is meant the miraculous use of languages never learned by the speaker. Nothing but the most arbitrary exegesis can deny that this is the meaning, in the account given in Acts ii. There are, moreover, other passages in the New Testament[2] in which allusion is made to the *γλώσσαις ἑτεραις* or *γλώσσαις καιναῖς* or simply *γλώσσαις* or *γλώσσῃ λαλεῖν*, and on comparing them with 1 Cor. xii. 10, it is evident that one and the same thing is denoted by them all, viz., a supernatural *χάρισμα* of the early church. With reference tc some of these passages (particularly Mark xvi. 17, compared with Acts ii.), the interpretation required in the principal passage in the second chapter of Acts, is in itself the most probable; and with regard to the remainder, this interpretation is at least not impossible, — as is proved by the great number of interpreters who have thus explained them. It might therefore be very fairly maintained, that in each and all of these passages, the employment of foreign languages that have not been learned is intended, and that the *χάρισμα* itself, though having its highest value and importance only on the day of Pentecost, still continued to exist for some time after, as a reminiscence of the great event of that day; thus having also a secondary emblematic signification, such as the other class of interpreters would attribute to it as the sole and only one. At the same time, however, it cannot be denied that the expressions, *γλώσσῃ* (1 Cor. xiv.) and *γλώσσαις καιναῖς λαλεῖν* (Mark xvi.), when taken in connection with the sense and connection of many of the passages, at least render possible, if they do not directly recommend, another explanation of this *χάρισμα*, in the above mentioned texts: viz., a *new* and *not ordinarily intelligible mode of utterance*, produced by the Holy Ghost, and expressive of the highest exaltation and ecstasy of the mind. It may therefore be the most comprehensive and accurate explanation, if we understand by the *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* etc. in *all* the textual passages, one and the same thing *essentially*; viz., the *χάρισμα* of a new mode of utterance given by the Holy Ghost, which *χάρισμα* however *manifested* itself in a *twofold form*; sometimes as the ability to use foreign languages that had never been acquired by the speaker, as on the day of Pentecost; and sometimes as an utterance, unintelligible to the common auditor, of the deep inspiration of an ecstatic state of soul. Neither need the two forms be regarded, necessarily, as insulated from each other. On the day of Pentecost, the employment of foreign languages, though the predominant characteristic of the working of the Holy Spirit, may not have altogether excluded the ecstatic condition produced by the same agency, as Acts ii. 13, would seem to indicate; and the ecstatic utterances, described in 1 Cor. xiv, may have been accompanied with more or less of the same ability that was uppermost on the first bestowment of the *χάρισμα*. Perhaps these two forms, of the one agency of the Holy Spirit exerted with reference to language or utterance, are indicated in the phrase, 1 Cor. xiii. i, *ἐὰν ταῖς γλώσσαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων*: the former denoting the use of foreign languages, and the latter the ecstatic utterances of the soul rapt in the angelic consciousness.

---

[1] Acts ii. 41–47.

[2] Mark xvi. 17; Acts x. 46; xix. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 2 et seq.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

THE APOSTLES: AND THEIR AGENCY IN PLANTING THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN DIFFERENT LOCALITIES.

Cave Antiquitates Apostolicae, or, the History of the Apostles. Buddei Ecclesia Apostolica. Hess Geschichte und Schriften der Apostel Jesu. Lücke Comm. de ecclesia Christianorum apostolica. G. J. Planck Geschichte des Christenthums in der Periode seiner ersten Einfüh. durch Jesum u. d. Apostel. Neander Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der christ. Kirche durch die Apostel; translated by Ryland. Rothe Die Anfänge der Kirche und ihrer Verfassung. Anger De temporum in Actis Apostolorum ratione. Wieseler Chronologie der apost. Zeitalters bis zum Tode der Apostel Paulus und Petrus. Schwegler Das nachapostol. Zeitalter. Baumgarten Apostolic History. Schaff History of the Apostolic Church. Benson Planting of the Christian Religion.

§ 13.

THE COLLEGE OF APOSTLES.

The influences and effects of the first Christian pentecost were continued through the medium of the *Apostles*. These were the first, and inspired, organs of the Holy Spirit, who now followed up the creative agency of his first effusion, by which the Christian Church was established, with a preserving and perpetuating influence. Of these apostles, only four come prominently into view, whether we have regard to authorship or to active labor. *Peter*, *John*, *James the younger*, and *Paul the apostle of the Gentiles*, representatives as it were of the principal types of Christian character, were the chief instruments through which the gospel was carried over the then known world, and has been preserved in a written form for all time. Of the remaining apostles, as well as of the seventy other disciples of Christ (Luke x.), there are but few reliable accounts. The list, according to Matthew x. 2–4, contains the following: *Andrew* the brother of Peter, *James the elder* the brother of John, whom Herod Agrippa about the year 44 put to the sword, as a proof to the Jews of his zeal for their ancient religion (Acts xii. 2), *Philip*, *Thomas*, *Bartholomew*, *Matthew* the author of the Gospel, *Judas* surnamed Lebbeus and Thaddeus, and *Simon* the Canaanite. According to Matthew xxviii. 19, they were to go into all the world and preach the gospel. According to an ancient tradition (Eusebius, V. 18), Christ commanded them to remain in Jerusalem until twelve years after his ascension; and as matter of fact we find them for some time in this city, testifying by word, and miracle, and in the midst of suffering and persecution from which they were sometimes delivered by direct divine interference, what they could not refrain from making known.[1] Probably the eight above-named apostles, following the example of Christ, labored chiefly in Palestine and the adjacent countries, and mostly among the Jews. According to Eusebius, (III. 31), Philip preached also in Phrygia, where he died. Some of them undertook more distant missionary journeys: Andrew to Scythia (Eusebius, III. 1); Thomas to Parthia and India; Bartholomew to India (§ 18); Matthew to Ethiopia (Rufinus, h. e. X. 9; Socrates, h. e. I. 19); Judas to Arabia. All of these eight, Philip excepted, are said to have suffered martyrdom.

In the place of *Judas Iscariot* the traitor, finally (though not until *after* the institution of the supper, Luke xxii. 20, 21) expelled from the communion of the disciples, and coming to a horrible end by suicide (Matt. xxvii. 4; Acts i. 18), the eleven chose *Matthias* by lot (Acts i. 26). Since this occurred before the special outpouring of the Holy Ghost (Acts ii.), which the apostles had been commanded by Christ to wait for (Acts i. 4; Luke xxiv. 49), some would regard the act as a hasty one, performed *without* the command of Christ, if not *against* it. This judgment is itself a hasty one; for the chief purpose of this election was, merely to secure an actual eye-witness of the resurrection, in the place of Iscariot, and the selection was left wholly to divine providence (Acts i. 15–26). Christ himself afterward chose *Paul* as one of his inspired apostles. But inasmuch as he was destined to be pre-eminently an apostle to the Gentiles, and to some extent, consequently, to be separated from the others (Acts xxii. 21; Gal. i. 16), and since in the Apocalypse (xxi. 14) only twelve apostles are spoken of, — in harmony with the passages in Matthew (xix. 28) and Luke (xxii. 30), where the original Jewish apostles are evidently intended, — there is no valid reason for impeaching the apostolate of Matthias, and Paul should be regarded as the thirteenth: the apostle of the Gentiles, whose very important apostolic activity was to run parallel with that of the twelve, both in doctrine and practice.

---

[1] Acts iv. 33; v. 21, 42; v. 12, 18, 40; v. 19.

THE THEORY OF THE TUBINGEN SCHOOL.

The view has been advanced and ingeniously defended in modern times, that the apostles were anything but the inspired and infallible organs of Christianity. On the contrary, in the apostolic age there was no genuine Christianity in existence, but merely a one-sided and heated contest between Petrine and Pauline prejudices. On the one hand there was the Petrine Ebionitism, with which the Apostle Paul, as the preacher of the so-called Gentile-Christianity, was in constant feud, without however being able himself to keep clear of some of the essential features of Ebionitism; so that for the apostolic period, pure Christianity was a thing yet to be. It was not until into the second century, that the understanding was brought about between the Petrine and Pauline churches, through the skill and shrewdness of an unknown mediator between the two, and that union resulted, for which, in the age of the apostles, neither Paul with his rough and energetic temper, nor still less the other disciples of Jesus were ripe. According to the Tübingen theory, Christianity proper owes its origin to the doctrine of the Logos, which was in reality the product of the second century, and falsely attributed to the Ebionitish John.

The principal support of this novel view is a negative one. The theorist postulates the *spuriousness* of that which contradicts it in the archives of the apostolic age. "Matthew, Mark, and Luke, are post-apostolic, and more or less traditional; John's Gospel arose far down in the second century, a speculative and symbolical invention without historical substance: the Acts of the Apostles were composed long after the death of Peter and Paul, for the purpose of cloaking over the dissension between these apostles; the Epistle to the Romans is spurious in the last two chapters; Corinthians and Galatians are genuine, but Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians, are spurious; the Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, are spurious; the first and second of Peter, the first, second, and third of John, the Epistles of James and of Jude, are all spurious: the Revelation of John is genuine, apostolic, and primitively Christian,—by which is meant that it is a genuinely Ebionitish production, full of hatred towards Paul and the Pauline Christianity."[1]

§ 14.

PETER.

Compare Neander Planting and Training; Schaff History of the Apostolic Church, pp. 348–377; Olshausen Commentary in locis.

The apostle Peter was selected to lay the foundations of the new church, as the first leader and spokesman of the disciples.

Simon Peter, a fisherman, the son of *Jona* (John i. 43; Matt. iv. 18), a native of Bethsaida in Galilee (John i. 45), a man of fiery swiftly-grasping mind and of impetuous energy, was brought by Andrew his brother (Matt. iv. 18; x. 2), at that time a disciple of John the Baptist, to Christ (John i. 43), who clearly knew what was in him. The healing of his stepmother by Christ (Luke iv. 38), strengthened the impression already made. He now became with his whole heart a disciple of Christ, whom he recognized and loved as the Messiah, with a knowledge and fervor somewhat in advance of his fellow disciples. He first explicitly confessed that Jesus was the Messiah, the son of the living God (Matt. xvi. 16); and upon this occasion Christ repeats with emphasis what he had said of him in their first interview, that he was *κηφᾶς*, the rock, upon which he would build his church. These words of the Lord evidently refer, primarily, to the Petrine confession of faith, and are consequently addressed equally to all the apostles as *believers* in the Messiahship of Christ. Besides this primary general reference, they may have also a secondary personal one to Peter himself; designating him as the spokesman of the circle. He is named first in the list of the apostles (Matt. x. 2), and appears as the bold and fearless leader of the disciples, in the scenes immediately succeeding the ascension of Christ (Acts ii.–v.). This apostle did not, however, in the outset prove to be worthy of such a praise and distinction. On the night of his Lord's betrayal, he cowardly denied all acquaintance with him, and after the resurrection heard Christ's mild but powerful reproach (John xxi. 15). But having received the power of the Holy Ghost, he ever after testified with boldness and courage of what his own eyes had seen. His discourse on the day of pentecost (Acts ii. 14 et seq.), was the first distinct enunciation of the Christian system by an apostle, and resulted in the addition of three thousand to the church. As the first leader of the new church, in the name of all the members (Acts iv. 8 et seq.), he made a confession of the common faith before the high priests and all the people, and in spite of repeated threatenings and imprisonments continued in this confession (Acts iv. 3, 18 seq.; v. 18, 29 seq.). In and by the name of Jesus, he performed miracles of healing (Acts iii; v. 15 seq.; ix. 32 seq.), restored the dead to life (Acts ix. 36 seq.), and brought death upon the living as a retribution (Acts v. 1–10).

---

[1] Quoted by Kurtz Handbuch § 132. See, for an able criticism and reply to Baur, Dietlein Das Urchristenthum.

The first extension of Christianity to Samaria, — by the disciples who had been driven from Jerusalem (Acts viii. 4 seq.), and particularly by the deacons and the evangelist *Philip* (Acts viii. 5–40; xxi. 8) after the death of the young deacon *Stephen*, the first Christian martyr (Acts vi. vii.), — called Peter, whose place in the mother church at Jerusalem now fell to James, together with *John* his already tried companion, to that city about the year 35. After a season of successful labor among the new converts, who now for the first time received the gift of the Holy Ghost through the apostles, Peter and John returned to Jerusalem (Acts viii. 25), preaching the gospel on their way in many places. In a later journey of visitation, Peter extended his labors still further (Acts ix. 32 seq.). During his stay at Joppa, the wonderful incidents connected with the heathen centurion *Cornelius* of Caesarea occurred (Acts x.), by which, Peter, first, of all the apostles, was divinely instructed to impart Christian baptism to believing Gentiles without requiring the observance of the Jewish ceremonial law, and was thereby enabled to justify his procedure before the church at Jerusalem (Acts xi. 2 seq.). The centre of his subsequent labors was now once more in Jerusalem; for though fully agreeing with Paul in adopting the evangelical doctrine in respect to the admission of Gentiles into the church, having been taught it by a special vision from heaven, he yet felt it to be his own particular mission to preach the gospel to the Jews. But the fate of the elder James threatening him through the cruelty of Herod Agrippa, from which he was only preserved by the angel of God in answer to the prayers of the church (Acts xii.), he was led to leave Jerusalem for some length of time about the year 44. It would agree with the order of events to regard this as the time of Peter's residence at Antioch; during which, momentarily yielding to a weak impulse, he practically renounced his previous principles respecting the admission of Gentile converts, and was rebuked therefor by Paul his junior (Gal. ii. 11 seq.). But exegetico-chronological grounds seem to favor a later date for this residence at Antioch. Ever after this occurrence, however, Peter acted in the most hearty and inward agreement with Paul. And how indeed could it be otherwise; since it was specially through Peter's influence at the council of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem (about the year 50), that the Pauline principles were adopted, and recommended to the churches (Acts xv.)!

A man of the zeal and energy of Peter could not always remain in Palestine. No further mention is made of him in the accounts given of the Palestine churches in the Acts of the Apostles, and we know little with certainty of his apostolic travels and labors. The ancient and very fragmentary notices respecting them, that have come down to us in the so-called *Περίοδοι Πέτρου,* and in the equally apocryphal *Κήρυγμα Πέτρου,* certainly contain some historical data, along with their fictions invented to subserve a polemic interest of either a grossly Pauline or of an Anti-Pauline sort.[1] The indefinite (introduced with *ἔοικεν*) account by Origen (Eusebius III. 1), of Peter's preaching the Gospel among the dispersed Jews in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia Minor, may possibly be only a hasty inference from 1 Peter i. 1; while, at the same time, the same thing is related by Jerome (De vir. ill. c. 1) and Epiphanius (Haer. XXVII. 6). The account by Eusebius (II. 14, 15), who refers somewhat loosely to the authority of Clemens Alexandrinus, of Peter's visit to Rome in the time of Claudius (emperor from 41–54), is rendered doubtful by the connection with it of an alleged disputation between Peter and Simon Magus at this time. The collision between these two, in Samaria, occurred earlier, and the account itself wears a fabulous air. It is, moreover, difficult to credit the assertion of Peter's residence at Rome so early as the reign of this emperor, from the fact that no mention is made of it either in the Acts of the Apostles or in the Epistles of Paul. Still, it is not impossible that Peter may have made a *short visit* to the metropolis as early as the time of Claudius; and on the other hand it may be that this account in Eusebius rests merely upon the fact of a later residence of this apostle in this city. But the statement of Jerome (De vir. ill. c. 1), likewise based upon the Eusebian account, that Peter was bishop of Rome for twenty-five years preceding his martyrdom, contradicts the entire chronology of the apostolic history. From the passage 1 Peter v. 13, on the contrary, if the name "Babylon" is to be taken literally, as the character of the epistle warrants, the conclusion is justified, that Peter, attended by Mark his frequent companion, and the writer of the second Gospel which obtained its canonical authority from Peter,[1] had extended his labors into Persia, where many Jews had taken up their residence, and had chosen this part of Asia generally as the seat of his missionary efforts. From here, or at least soon after his return from here, he wrote, perhaps about the year 60, his *First Epistle*, — a document evincing, conclusively, the entire agreement between the Petrine and Pauline conceptions of Christianity. Its purpose was, to confirm in the faith, the Pauline churches in Asia Minor, which were now suffering from the incoming errors and heresies of the time; and it is written with the genuine terseness and energy of Peter.

---

[1] The first mentioned of these represents Peter as an Ebionite. The Κήρυγμα Πέτρου, mentioned by Clem. Alex. Strom. VI. p. 636, of which the remaining fragments are found in Grabe's Spicilegium and Fabricius's Codex Apoc. Nov. Testamenti, is a narrative of the life and controversies of Peter, in which he appears as the opponent of Ebionitism and in full agreement with Paul.

In the last part of his life, and probably after he had written his *Second Epistle*, the apostle turned his course from the East to the West. The great metropolis of the world, where the gospel had already been preached and a church had been established, would now naturally attract a mind like that of Peter; and in the last part of Nero's reign, in the year 67 or 68, he died a martyr's death at Rome. All the oldest and most trustworthy writers concur in this statement. It is either represented as universally received, or else is personally adopted, by Clement of Rome (Ep. I. ad Cor. c. 5), Dionysius of Corinth and the Roman presbyter Caius (in Euseb. II. 25), Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. III. 1), Tertullian (Con. Marc. IV. 5; De praescr. c. 36; Scorpiace c. 15), Origen (in Eusebius III. 1), Lactantius (De mortt. persecc. c. 2), and Eusebius (II. 22; III. 12). The apostle Peter died on the cross, according to Tertullian (De praescriptt. c. 36); crucified with his head downwards, according to Rufinus's version of a somewhat obscure passage in Origen found in Eusebius (III. 1), and according also to a statement of Jerome (De vir. ill. c. 1).

---

[1] Papias, cited by Eusebius III. 39; Irenaeus Adv. Haer. III. 1; III. 10, 6; Tertull. Con. Marcion. IV. 5; Clem. Alex. in Euseb. II. 15 and VI. 14; Origen in Euseb. VI. 25; Jerome De vir. ill. c. 8.

§ 15.

PAUL.

Massutius Paulus Apostolus. Witsius Praelect. de vita Pauli, in the Meletemata Leidensia. Pearson Annales Paulini. Lange De vita et epistolis Pauli. Paley Horae Paulinae. Hemsen Der Apostel Paulus; translated in Biblical Repository, 1837. Neander Planting and Training. Tholuck Vermischte Schriften, Th. II. pp. 272–329. Conybeare and Howson Life and Epistles of St. Paul. Köllner Ueber den Geist, Lehre, und Leben des Apostel Paulus. Schott Erörterung einiger wicht. chronol. Punkte in der Lebensgeschichte des Ap. Paulus. Wurm in the Tübinger Zeitschrift, 1833 (chronological). Baur Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Schaff History of the Apostolic Church, pp. 226–343.

The successor of Peter, appointed to complete that great work of evangelizing the cultivated Gentile world which this apostle had been divinely instructed to commence, was the apostle Paul.

Paul, first named Saul, — which name he exchanged, according to a common custom among non-resident Jews, for a Roman one, on entering upon his work and residence in the Roman world, — was born in Tarsus, the capital of Cilicia, of Jewish parents who had obtained the Roman citizenship (Acts xxii. 3, 27 seq.; Phil. iii. 5).[1] Perhaps he had felt the influence of the Grecian culture which flourished here, but his parents intended him for a Rabbi. Accordingly, he soon commenced the study of the Jewish theology, in the schools of the Pharisees at Jerusalem; at the same time, in accordance with the Jewish custom, learning a trade, by means of which he afterwards when an apostle supported himself without charge to the churches (Acts xxii. 3; xviii 3; 1 Cor. ix. 14 seq.; Phil. iv. 15 seq.). The principal teacher of Paul was the moderate and wise *Gamaliel*, the uncle of Hillel. His moderation, however, was not shared by his pupil, who, of a fiery mind and character, and grasping what he did grasp with his whole strength, became a most determined and zealous Pharisee. Earnestly seeking justification before God, by a most thoroughly ascetic and legal strain of all his moral force, he hardened himself against all Christian impressions and evangelical influences, and became the bitter enemy of the gospel which was now threatening the destruction of Phariseeism. Triumphing over the death of the martyr Stephen (Acts vii. 58; viii. 1; xxii. 20), he had already, under the authority of the government, hunted out and imprisoned many Christians, and given his voice in favor of their execution (Acts viii. 3; xxvi. 10); and now, "breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord" (Acts ix. 1), he had made preparations to persecute Christianity beyond the limits of Palestine, particularly at Damascus. On his journey thither he was suddenly converted, from the most vehement persecutor, into the most active and successful minister of the gospel, through the personal appearance and direct address of the Lord (Acts ix. 1 seq.; xxii. 5 seq.; xxvi. 10 seq. Compare Gal. i. 16, and 1 Tim. i. 12 seq.). Even if the account of this miracle were not the testimony of a companion of the apostle, and of himself also, and even if the oriental imagination were active enough, without the greatest mental imbecility or open deception, to compound such an occurrence out of a mere thunder-storm, who could rationally explain to himself, except on the supposition of the most direct agency of God, this so entire as well as instantaneous change in the character and spirit of Paul; especially when taken in connection with the vast consequences of this event for the Christian church, which owes to it its whole establishment, formation, and developement in the Hellenistic world and the entire East! The date of the conversion of Paul has been variously assigned, but it probably falls within the year 35 or 36 after Christ.[1]

---

[1] According to Jerome Catal. c. 15. (5), Paul was born in the city Gyschala in Judea, and followed his parents to Tarsus; but the explicit statement of the apostle himself, in Acts xxii. 3, contradicts this.

---

[1] The time of Paul's conversion is determinable by comparing Gal. i. 15–18, and 2 Cor. xi. 32, with Josephus Archaeol. XVIII. 5, 1, 3. When Paul three years after his conversion leaves Damascus (Gal. i. 18), this Roman city is in the possession of the Arabian king Aretas, (2 Cor. xi. 32 seq., compared with Acts

As the appearance of Christ to his other disciples, after his resurrection. was the point from whence their illumination proceeded, so was the appearance of Christ upon this journey to the apostle Paul, a corresponding beginning of a supernatural inspiration; and the further developement of his spiritual knowledge, as in the instance of the other apostles, was not the work of any man, but of the Holy Ghost. Ananias at Damascus was merely the instrument of revealing the divine grace to Paul, and of bringing him into communication with the Christian community after he had been baptized (Acts ix. 17 seq.). For the first three years after his conversion, Paul, while earnestly laboring for the spread of the gospel (Acts ix. 20, 22), and yet at the same time preparing himself more thoroughly for this work, abode partly at Damascus, and partly in northern Arabia. At length, having with great difficulty escaped the plots of inimical Jews at Damascus, he journeyed once more to Jerusalem (Gal. i. 17 seq.; Acts ix. 26). Here he was at first naturally regarded with suspicion; but *Barnabas* of Cyprus, a zealous and esteemed member of the Jerusalem church (Acts iv. 36 seq.), and perhaps previously acquainted with Paul, introduced him to Peter and James. At Jerusalem, also, he drew upon himself the persecution of the Jews, by his active zeal for the gospel, and having received a second, and still more direct, appointment from on high to preach the gospel to the Gentiles (Acts xxii. 17–21), in addition to what had already been indicated at his conversion (Acts. ix. 15; xxvi. 17 seq.; Gal. i. 16), he left this city, fifteen days after his arrival, and went to Tarsus (Acts ix. 30).

From this time onward, Paul, in accordance with divine illumination and the developement of the grace imparted to him, was filled with that great idea of his life upon which his extraordinary call to the apostolic office, as supplement-

ix. 22–25). This must have been during the war between the Romans and Aretas; which began in the year that Tiberius died (viz. 37 A. D.) according to Josephus Archaeol. XVIII. 5, 3. In the year 38, according to Dio Cassius LIX. 9, 12, the difficulties with Arabia were settled. Three years before, therefore about the year 35 or 36, the conversion of Paul is to be regarded as occurring.

ary to that of the first twelve apostles, was founded: viz., that the Heathen, as well as the Jews, were destined to become members of the one great kingdom of God upon earth, and that the same condition for both parties, for entrance into it, could not be obedience to the Jewish ceremonial law, — a condition that would mislead the pagan world into an entire misconception of the person and work of Christ, — but must be a living and justifying faith in the Redeemer.

About this time, Hellenistic-Jewish Christians had preached the gospel, with much success, among the heathen, in *Antioch*, the great metropolis of the East. To this city, Barnabas, who had been sent out from Jerusalem, brought Paul, and both labored together here for a year (Acts. xi. 22–26). The name *Χριστιανοί,* a designation which the Antiochian heathen were the first to give to believers in Christ,[1] is an evidence of the success of Paul and Barnabas in this city. A famine which now occurred in Palestine (according to Josephus, Archaeol. XX. 5, 2, in or after the 4th year of the reign of Claudius), was the occasion of the sending of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, to carry a collection that had been made sometime previous to the outbreak of the dearth, at the suggestion of a prophet Agabus (Acts xi. 30; xii. 25). This second journey of Paul to Jerusalem probably falls, therefore, within the year 44.

Soon after his return to Antioch (about the year 45), Paul, in company with Barnabas, — both having been consecrated, in accordance with divine instruction, by prayer and the laying on of hands, to a more extended official labor among the heathen world,[2] — commenced his *first apostolic journey*, through Cyprus, Pamphylia, Pisidia, and Lycaonia (Acts xiii. xiv.). They uniformly addressed themselves first to the Jews. In case of repulse from them, they turned to the Gentiles, — a procedure which drew upon Paul, now and during his whole life, the virulent persecution of the Jews (2 Cor. xi. 24 seq.), — and formed churches composed of Jewish and Pagan converts, of whom the latter were the larger proportion. Having completed their proposed tour, they returned to Antioch, which was now the centre for missions among the heathen.

---

[1] Believers had called themselves *μαϑηταί, ἅγιοι, πιστοί,* or such like names.

[2] In addition to this consecration, Paul, according to his own account in 2 Cor. xii. 2 seq., compared with Gal. i. 1, deemed himself to have received a yet more direct, and as it were heavenly, ordination to his apostolic work; the equivalent, in his case, for the commission given to the other disciples by the Redeemer, previous to his ascension, in John xx. 21 seq., and Matthew xxviii. 18 seq.

About this time Jewish-Christians from Jerusalem came to Antioch, who obstinately defended their view that the Gentile converts must observe the Jewish ceremonial law, and thereby awakened controversies and conscientious scruples in the new religious societies (Acts xv.).[1] On this account, Paul and Barnabas were sent (perhaps in the year 50, as, according to Gal. ii. 1, it was fourteen years after his conversion that he took the third journey to Jerusalem: the second journey being mentioned in Acts xi. 30, and xii. 25, and the fourth in Acts xviii. 18–22) as delegates to Jerusalem (Acts xv.), and the subject was publicly discussed by all the apostles, the elders of the church, and the delegates, in a general *convention of apostles and elders at Jerusalem.* Its common faith, and the spirit of love resting upon it, united the whole assemblage in the adoption of a few simple principles. First, *Peter* rose and reminded them of the effect of the gospel among the heathen, who had been sanctified without the observance of the ceremonial law; he himself having been the instrument employed. Next, the assembly listened to the report of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and then *James* proposed to give the Gentile-Christians, not the entire ceremonial law, but only some precepts of a temporary nature, in order, through the observance of them, to keep the Pagan converts aloof from some things that stood in close connection with the pagan idol-worship, and from others which the Jews were accustomed to regard with peculiar abhorrence.

---

[1] According to *one* view, Peter came to Antioch at this time (Gal. ii.). Previous to this he had taken no offence at the free intercourse with the heathen, but now, from respect to these Jews, he withdrew from them. This behavior Paul frankly rebuked as hypocritical, and with good effect so far as Peter was concerned, though these Jewish-Christians did not yield their prejudices. According to *another* reckoning (see § 14), this passage at Antioch, between Paul and Peter, happened later, though upon a similar occasion.

The proposition of James was unanimously approved, and made known to the Gentile-Christian churches, particularly to those of Syria and Cilicia in the first place, by a letter written in the name of the apostles, elders, and the whole church in Jerusalem. Between the ceremonially inclined Jewish-Christian churches on the one hand, and the freer-minded Gentile-Christian churches on the other, a visible discrepancy with regard to externals continued, indeed, to exist, but it was repressed, and gradually removed, by the reception of the common apostolic doctrine and the possession of a common evangelical spirit.

Soon after this apostolic convention, Paul departed, in the year 51 or 52, from Antioch, upon his *second apostolic journey* through Syria, Cilicia, Lycaonia, Phrygia, Galatia, and then,—passing over for the first time into Europe,—through Macedonia (preaching the word at Philippi, Thessalonica, and Beraea), through Attica (preaching at Athens), and, lastly, into Achaia, (making a stop of a year and a half at Corinth). He then made a journey to attend the feast at Jerusalem, and returned to Antioch in the year 53 or 54 (Acts xv.–xviii.).[1] While at Corinth, Paul wrote the two *Epistles to the Thessalonians*, — the first of that series of inspired epistles, elicited by the necessities of particular churches yet enunciating at the same time the universal truths of Christianity, which constitutes so large a portion of the New Testament canon.

In the year 54 or 55, leaving Antioch, he began his *third apostolic journey* (Acts, xviii. 23; xxi.). He first entered upon the visitation of the churches he had planted in Phrygia and

---

[1] Upon this, and his after journeys, Paul was accompanied by his assistants; of whom were *Silas*, *Timotheus* especially dear to him, *Titus*, *Luke* the author of the Gospel published with Paul's authority and of the Acts of the Apostles, and *Mark*. Paul met with *Timothy* at Lystra (Acts xvi. 2). A Jew on the mother's side (2 Tim. i. 5), he received circumcision (Acts xvi. 3), and was Paul's faithful assistant particularly among the Jews (Acts xvii.–xx.). According to Euseb. III. 4, and Theodoret, Com. upon Pastoral Epistles, Timothy suffered martyrdom as bishop of Ephesus toward the end of the first century. *Titus*, of pagan parentage, first mentioned as the attendant of Paul at the apostles' convention at Jerusalem, was not circumcised, though the Jews demanded it from Paul (Gal. ii 1, 3). He is said to have suffered martyrdom in Crete (Euseb. and Theodoret).

Galatia, and then took up his residence for a season at Ephesus. From this point he could more easily labor for the spread of Christianity in Asia Minor, and also obtain intelligence from the churches already founded. Learning that Judaizing errorists had obtained entrance into the Galatian churches, and were endeavoring to force the Jewish ceremonial law upon the heathen converts, he wrote from Ephesus his *Epistle to the Galatians*, in which he strikes at the very lowest root of legalism. He also learned that divisions were threatening the destruction of the church at Corinth. The Corinthian Christians (1 Cor. i. 11, 12), regarding the heralds of Christianity as if they were the authors of salvation, had split into two parties, — a so-called Pauline and a so-called Petrine. The latter and smaller division, holding with great strictness to the ceremonial law, boasted of a Christianity that had come to themselves through the pillars of the Palestine church, and denied the apostolical authority of Paul; while the other division, setting an extravagant estimate upon the native and merely human characteristics of Paul, would have nothing to do with the other apostles, and, boasting of their knowledge and evangelical freedom, contented themselves merely with a rough and rude opposition to the Judaizing party. A third party, calling itself after Apollos,[1] was a branch indeed of the pseudo-Pauline; but, dissatisfied with the plain simplicity of the Pauline style of preaching, would listen to Christian truth only in the philosophico-rhetorical forms of the Alexandrine school. A fourth, so-called *Christ*ian, party seems to have entirely rejected the historical gospel of Peter and Paul, and to have set forth an ideal gnosticising Christianity as the pure doctrine of Christ. These and other accounts of the condition of the Corinthian church induced Paul, after he had informed himself still more particularly by a letter received from the Corinthians themselves,[1] to send them the *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, rich in apostolical wisdom and tenderness. After laboring two or three years in Ephesus (Acts xix. 10; xx. 31), Paul, by reason of a popular tumult excited by Demetrius, a maker of images of Diana, whose craft was in danger (Acts xix. 23 seq.), departed from Ephesus, perhaps in the year 57, to Troas, and then made a visit to the Macedonian churches. While in Macedonia he wrote the *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, and soon after went down to Corinth (Acts xx. 2, 3). Here he remained three months, and wrote the *Epistle to the Romans*, making use of an opportunity he had long desired to re-state the evangelical system, for the Roman brotherhood, in this chief epistle of the New Testament. About the year 58, passing through Macedonia, Troas, and Miletus, at which latter place he took leave of the elders of Ephesus full of heavy forebodings, he journeyed to Jerusalem to carry a contribution made by the Gentile-Christians as an expression of their fraternal love for their Jewish brethren (Acts xx. 3 seq. Compare Rom. xv. 25).

---

[1] Apollos, (Apollo, Apollonius) a learned and eloquent Alexandrine and disciple of John Baptist, became acquainted with Aquila and Priscilla, — the friendly hosts of Paul at Corinth soon after their banishment from Rome by Claudius, — while they were accompanying Paul from Corinth to Ephesus during his second journey, and was by them instructed still more thoroughly in Christianity. He continued the work Paul had commenced at Corinth. Acts xviii. 2, 3, 24–28 Compare v. 18 seq.; 1 Cor. iii. 6.

From the overseers of the Jerusalem church Paul received an affectionate reception; but there was a large body of imperfectly enlightened members who looked upon him as the enemy of the Old Testament dispensation. This portion of the church, Paul endeavored to pacify, by the observance of a distinctively Jewish custom (Acts xxi. 26 seq.). There were, however, at that time in Jerusalem, Jews from Asia Minor, who were in the highest degree inimical to Paul. Their outcry against him set the entire Jewish population into excitement, and Paul escaped death only by being taken into custody by the captain of the Roman garrison[2] (Acts xxi. 27 seq.). In vain did he defend himself (Acts xxii.–xxiv.) before the people, whom he at first mollified by ad-

---

[1] Whether in answer to a letter sent to them by the apostle, is uncertain. See 1 Cor. vii. 1; v. 9.

[2] Claudias Lysias, Acts xxiii. 26.

dressing them in the Hebrew tongue, but afterwards excited them to new rage by the mention of his apostolic calling to preach to the Gentiles; in vain again, before the Sanhedrim, whose wrath he neutralized by confessing Phariseeism in opposition to Sadduceeism, so far as the former contained truths that belonged also to the gospel system; and, lastly, in vain, before the Roman procurator Felix, at Caesarea, whither the apostle had been sent by the governor Claudias Lysias, in order to deliver him from the violence of the Jews (Acts xxiii. 12 seq.). Felix, hoping that a bribe would be offered for his release, (Acts xxiv. 26), detained him as a prisoner for two years in Caesarea. Paul, failing to obtain justice from Festus the successor of Felix (Acts xxv.), appealed to the Emperor (Acts xxv. 11.), — being, moreover, desirous of proclaiming the gospel in the metropolis of the world, — and, after having made still another defence of himself before Agrippa II. (Acts xxv. 13 seq.), was carried prisoner to Rome about the year 61 (Acts xxvii.–xxviii.). Upon this journey also, as upon his earlier ones, the apostle experienced, amidst many sufferings and perils, tokens of the miraculous power of God towards him and by him. He spent two years at Rome (Acts xxviii. 30 seq.), chained to a soldier by the arm, yet having liberty to preach the gospel. That he did not confine himself to oral instruction, is proved
7 by his writings. During this imprisonment, he wrote the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, an animating circular-letter addressed to the churches of Pagan-Christians in Asia Minor; the *Epistle to the Colossians*, historically important on account of the indication, plainly apparent in it, as also in his pastoral epistles, of the incoming of a theosophico-ascetic spirit in connection with the already existing judaizing tendency among the churches; the friendly, and tenderly apostolic, private *Epistle to Philemon* in Colosse; and, lastly, the *Epistle to the Philippians*, the most familiar in its tone of all his public letters, and composed at a late point in this captivity, as is indicated by expressions in it.

The Acts of the Apostles closes with the second year of Paul's imprisonment at Rome. The inquiry arises whether the apostle was released from this imprisonment. There are no historical data that prove the negative, while the affirmative seems to be sufficiently established by the following considerations. In the first place, Paul would have been released at his trial before the procurators at Caesarea, had not Felix expected a bribe, and had not the yielding of Festus to the clamors of the Jews compelled him to appeal to the emperor at Rome (Acts xxiv. 26; xxv. 9; xxvi. 32). In the second place, a very ancient tradition that the gospel was carried into Spain by Paul, — an occurrence chronologically impossible before this imprisonment at Rome, — affords strong grounds for believing that the apostle was set free. This tradition was universally current in the fourth century,[1] but dates back to the second; it being mentioned in the old Italian canon of the New Testament discovered by Muratori, and Clement of Rome, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians (c. 5), adopts the statement and testifies to its credibility. And, lastly, the Second Epistle to Timothy necessitates the supposition of a second imprisonment at Rome, in order to account for the various geographico-statistical particulars which it contains.[2]

After his release from his first imprisonment, about the year 63 or 64, and doubtless before the breaking out of the Neronian persecution, Paul made an apostolic journey to Spain, as according to Rom. xv. 28, he had designed to do, and also visited the East and his Oriental churches,[3] — during which time he appears to have written, while in Macedonia, his *First Epistle to Timothy* then in Ephesus, and his *Epistle to Titus* then in Crete. Having returned to the West again, perhaps, according to Dionysius of Corinth, in company with Peter, he was once more thrown into captivity during one of the last years of Nero's reign, in 67 or 68;

---

[1] Eusebius Hist. Eccl. II. 22, 25.

[2] For the justification of this chronology of the epistles of Paul, see Guericke Einleitung in das N. T.

[3] This visit to the East may possibly have been first, and that to Spain second, in order. That the apostle meditated a journey Eastward, is evident from Philippians ii. 24, and Philemon 22; and that this intention was carried out, seems to be implied in parts of the Second Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus.

a fact which rests, as an inference, upon the tradition respecting the place of his death. He had a hearing, indeed, but he saw a martyr's death in reserve (2 Tim. iv. 6–8, 16). His
/3 *Second Epistle to Timothy*, written at this time, is a noble memorial of the thoughts and feelings of a genuine christian martyr.[1] Paul was beheaded at Rome,[2] perhaps spared a more disgraceful mode of execution on the ground of being a Roman citizen. The great series of living and permanent Christian churches, reaching from that metropolis of the Roman Occident even to the borders of the Orient, was the result of his labors, and the monument of his tomb. He had certainly "labored more abundantly than they all" (1 Cor. xv. 9, 10).

§ 16.

JAMES.

Neander Planting and Training; Paulus und Jacobus. Schaff Apostolic Church, pp. 377 sqq.

The apostle *James the younger*, the son of Alpheus (Cleopas) and Mary the sister of the mother of Jesus, after Peter the president of the church at Jerusalem,[3] presents a striking contrast to the apostle Paul, in his natural character, in his labors, and in the sphere of his labors. According to the New Testament account, as well as according to later testimony, he was, in individual character and official position, the principal representative of the Jewish-Christian tendency in the apostolic age. To him, — the only apostle who seems to have undertaken no distant apostolic journeys, — it had been allotted, both on internal and external grounds, to labor for the spread of the gospel among the Jews, from Jerusalem as a point of departure; on which account he himself paid a strict observance to the Jewish ceremonial law, being for this reason styled *Δίκαιος* (Justus).[1] At the same time he distinctly recognized, in the apostolic convention (Acts xv.), the doctrine that man is justified by *faith in Christ;* he decidedly declared himself against the demand of the pharisaically inclined Jewish-Christians, that the ceremonial law should be obligatory upon the converts from paganism; and proposed the plan for the union of the two parties. Moreover, after this, there was undisturbed harmony between him and Paul, and the important memorial which we have from him in the *Epistle of James,* — a circular-letter to the Jewish-Christian churches written with reference primarily to *their* condition and needs, — evinces that both apostles were substantially accordant in doctrine; that each developed one and the same fundamental idea in a particular form, and with a particular polemic reference, — Paul opposing faith, as the *living* source of genuine good works, to the claims of dead morality; James opposing *genuine* works, as the expression of a living belief, to the claims of a dead faith.

---

[1] It is in the last of the Pauline Epistles. The *Epistle to the Hebrews* seems to belong to the Pauline Epistles in only a secondary sense. An unbiassed mind can find in it nothing unworthy of Paul, or unlike him: on the contrary it wears a decidedly Pauline coloring, both in sentiment and style, except that the language appears to be somewhat purer and more ornate than is usual with this apostle. But while the East, to whom the epistle was directed, acknowledged its Pauline authorship, the West doubted it; and although the testimony of the former is now the predominant one in history, and the West has since yielded to it, yet the opposing views upon both sides are best conciliated in the middle theory, — that this epistle was written, under the eye and immediate dictation of the apostle Paul, by one of his most intimate pupils, and hence may with equal right be denominated Pauline and non-Pauline.

[2] Clemens Romanus, 1 Cor. 5; Caius Romanus, in Euseb. II. 25; Dionysius of Cor., in Euseb. II. 25; Eusebius himself II. 25. and III. 1, et alia. Jerome (Catal. c. 5) mentions his grave as being "in via Ostiensi."

[3] In the new New Testament (Acts xii. 17; xv. 13; xxi. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 7; Gal.

For a long time James enjoyed the esteem of the Jews;

---

i. 19; ii. 9, 12) James is represented only in general terms as a pillar in the church at Jerusalem; the succeeding church historians (Hegesippus in Euseb. II. 23; Clem. Alex. in Euseb. II. 1; Jerome and others, compared with Josephus, Archaeol. xx. 9, 1) expressly designate him as its leader or bishop.

[1] The identity of Jacobus Minor (Alphaei), with Jacobus Justus, the ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου and president of the church at Jerusalem, is proved, besides the N. T. data, by the testimony of Clem. Alex. in Euseb. II. 1, — which is followed by Jerome, Theodoret, Chrysostom, as well as the superscription of the Protevangelium Jacobi.

but at length, when Paul had been withdrawn from their resentment, they directed their enmity towards him. According to the statement of Hegesippus, which in the main is credited by Eusebius II. 23, they demanded of James that at Easter he should give testimony from the battlements of the temple against Christ. He witnessed, on the contrary, a decided and earnest confession for him, was thrown down headlong, then stoned alive, and finally while praying for his murderers was killed by a tanner with a club. Of this diffuse, and in its entire detail hardly credible, narrative of Hegesippus, thus much is expressly confirmed by Clem. Alexandrinus (in Euseb. II. 1, 23), viz.: that James was thrown from the temple, and slain with a club by a tanner. The fact of the stoning is also testified to by Josephus, who is silent regarding the accompanying circumstances, and simply relates that after the recall of Festus (in 64) the inhuman high priest Ananus, under the show of judicial procedure but in reality contrary to law, caused James to be stoned to death.

§ 17.

JOHN.

Neander Planting and Training. Introductions to the commentaries (upon John) of Olshausen, Lücke, Tholuck, Baumgarten-Crusius. Ebrard Evangelium Joh. u. d. neueste Hypothese. Schaff Apostolic Church, pp. 395–427.

That apostle stood in a more intimate personal relationship to Jesus than any of the others, who far outlived all the rest, and with whom the period of the direct revelation of Christianity, in the unity of its spirit and the variety of its forms, closed.

John, the son of the Galilean fisherman *Zebedee*, a young man of fiery and excitable, yet, at the same time, thoughtful and profound nature, became, through an awakened Messianic feeling, a disciple of John the Baptist, and by him was directed to Christ (Matt. iv. 21; John i. 35, seq.; Luke v. 10). His love to Jesus, — drawn forth not so much by the Messiahship, as in the case of Peter, as by the theanthropic Person of Christ, — was at first not free from an earthly and selfish element (Matt. xx. 20 seq.), and a carnal vehemence (Luke ix. 49, 51 seq.); and with reference to this passionate ardor, in conjunction however with a zealous affection for the Redeemer, and an evangelical energy springing out of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, Christ gave him, and his brother James the elder, the surname *Βοανεργές* (Mark iii. 17). Through a more and more entire self-surrendry to the Redeemer, the whole inward character of John was gradually transformed and transfigured into a profound and self-denying gentleness, and saintly blessedness in the communion of Jesus became the impulse and goal of his existence.

After the first Christian pentecost, we find John a zealous preacher of the gospel in Jerusalem with Peter (Acts iii. 4); and with Peter he also labored in Samaria (compare § 14). Next, he seems to have resided chiefly in Jerusalem (according to Nicephorus Callisti, H. E. II. 42, providing till her death for the mother of Jesus, who had been left to his care by Christ) as one of the more distinguished of the apostles (Gal. ii. 9), and as one of the pillars of the first church together with Peter and James, until he went to Asia Minor, — a step not taken, probably, till after Paul had left Asia Minor as a regular field of labor.[1] This region, now threatened by many secret and open enemies and corrupters of Christianity, he made the chief seat of his labors, taking up his abode at Ephesus.[2] Here he labored for a long series of years, by word, example, and writings, for the spread and establishment of apostolical Christianity, until his death.[1] The *Gospel* of John, and his *First Epistle*, a pastoral letter to the Asia Minor churches, belong to this period, and, judging from their style and contents, to the latter part of it. The two smaller private Epistles we also assign to this period.

---

[1] Had John labored in Asia Minor before the imprisonment of Paul at Rome, there must have been indications of it in the Acts of the Apostles, and the Pauline Epistles. This imprisonment of Paul, and his withdrawal from the region, furnished a motive and a necessity for John to take his place.

[2] Compare Polycarp, in Euseb. V. 20; Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. II. 22, 5; III. 3, 4; Clem. Alex. Qu. div. salv. c. 42; Polycrates of Ephesus, in Euseb. III. 31 and V. 24; Origen, in Euseb. III. 1; Eusebius, III. 23 etc.

But these labors were not destined to be unhindered. Not long after the Apostle's arrival in Asia Minor, Nero began his persecutions, and it is difficult to believe that the sword which had beheaded Peter and Paul could have altogether spared John, the sole one remaining of the apostolic pillars of the church. He was banished by Nero, to Patmos in the Aegean sea. According to the single and hardly sufficient testimony of Tertullian, De praescriptt. c. 36, he had previous to banishment been dragged to Rome, and been thrown uninjured into a caldron of boiling oil. This banishment to Patmos is supported by the unanimous testimony of the oldest fathers,[2] and it is being occasionally confirmed by historical discoveries. The *time* of the exile is less certainly established, though the period of the Neronian persecution is by far the most probable point for it.[3] At Patmos (Rev. i. 9) John was entrusted with the divine *Revelation* respecting the whole future of the kingdom of God on earth, which he committed to writing immediately on his return from exile, soon after the divine imparting, and certainly, therefore, before the composition of his Gospel. On returning to Ephesus, the apostle devoted himself with paternal zeal to the care and welfare of the churches of Asia Minor. In one of his visitatorial journeys, occurred the touching incident, illustrating the unwearied care of the aged apostle for the soul of a deeply fallen youth, mentioned by Clemens Alexandrinus and Eusebius (III. 23).[1] As in this occurrence we recognize the apostle's tenderness and forbearance towards the fallen, so we see his punitive earnestness towards teachers of false doctrine in the story, told by Polycarp and Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. III. 3), of his renunciation of all intercourse, even casual and ordinary, with Cerinthus.

---

[1] Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. II. 22, 5, and III. 3, 4; Origen, in Euseb. III. 1; and Euseb., III. 23.

[2] Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. V. 30, 3; Clem. Alex. Qu. div. salv. c. 42; Tertull. De praescriptt. c. 36; Polycrates of Ephesus, in Euseb. V. 24; Origen, Comm. in Mt. T. XXVI. 6; Euseb., III. 18, 20, 23, Demonstr. ev. III. 5, and Chron.; Jerome, De vir. ill. c. 9.

[3] The difficulty arises from the discrepancy in the early authorities. Eusebius and Jerome mention the reign of Domitian, as the time of John's exile; Theophylact and the younger Hippolytus, that of Nero; Tertullian, Clement, and Origen, give no date for it; Epiphanius specifies the reign of Claudius. See, for the date given in the text, the author's Einleitung ins N. T

In the last days of his extreme old age, the apostle confined his instructions to the simplest of practical exhortations; which welled up, however, from the profound depths of a paternal and saintly spirit. Jerome (Comm. in Ep. ad. Gal. c. 6) narrates an old tradition, that when the apostle John could no longer go into the congregations, on account of his bodily weakness, he caused himself to be carried to them, and with gentle voice merely said — "Children, love one another."[2] On being asked why he always repeated the same exhortation, he answered, — because this was the command of the Lord, and because enough was done if only this one thing were done. John lived into the reign of Trajan (Irenaeus Adv. Haer. II. 22, 5; III. 3, 4; Euseb. III. 23). His tomb was at Ephesus (Polycrates in Euseb. v. 24).

---

[1] The apostle had intrusted a certain youth to the care of a bishop; the youth fell grievously, and became the head of a band of robbers. On a later visit John learned what had happened; he sought the apostate in the forest, hastened after him as he fled from him, and at length conquered him by the power of evangelical love and encouragement.

[2] "Filioli, diligite alterutrum."

FIRST PERIOD: TO A. D. 311.

PART SECOND.

CAREER OF THE CHURCH DURING THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

SECTION FIRST.

The Spread and Limitation of Christianity.

CHAPTER FIRST.

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 18.

SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY IN PARTICULAR COUNTRIES.

Scarcely had the Christian church been established, when it found confessors and disciples in all parts of the known world. They were found in: —

1. Asia. The only seat of the church of Christ, immediately after pentecost, was *Jerusalem* (§ 12). The malice of the enemy, under the providence of God, led to its being planted out of Jerusalem, by Christians who had been driven from this city to *Samaria* (§ 14). Soon after this, *Palestine* generally, though Jerusalem was still the ecclesiastical centre, became the chief field of the labors of Peter during one portion of his life (§ 14), of James (§ 16), and of most of the other apostles (§ 13). From Jerusalem and Palestine, Christianity early spread to *Antioch* and *Syria* (§ 15), and from thence, through the labors of Paul and his companions, to

Asia Minor (§ 15; compare also § 17), and also, in a way not certainly determined, to *Mesopotamia.* From the statement of Eusebius, I. 13, that after Christ's ascension, induced by the pretended correspondence between Christ and Abgarus of Edessa (§ 11), Thaddeus, one of the seventy disciples, was sent by the apostle Thomas to Edessa in Osrhoëne, and converted the king together with his people to Christianity, we may at least infer the very early diffusion of the Christian religion in these parts. Towards the end of the second century, Edessa was ruled by a Christian prince, Abgar Bar Manu. From Edessa Christianity spread into *Persia.* Jews from this country had been witnesses of the wonderful occurrences of the day of pentecost, and, still later, Peter (§ 14), and also the apostle Thomas (according to the tradition given by Origen, Euseb. III. 1), had preached the gospel there. In the middle of the second century, Bardesanes (§ 47) alludes (in Euseb. Praep. ev. VI. 10) to the spread of Christianity in Media, Persia, Parthia, and Bactria; and, in the third century, the existence of the sect of Manichaeans proves the general prevalence of the Christian religion in those regions. From Edessa and Persia the seeds of Christianity seem to have been sown, in the third century, as far as *Armenia* (Dionys. Corinth. in Euseb. VI. 46). A tradition of the old Syrian-Persian church in Malabar, (given by Cosmas Indicopleustes in the 6th century), designates the apostle Thomas as the first preacher of the gospel in *East India*, and Gregory Nazianzen (Orat. 25 ad Arianos) mentions that Thomas preached in *India.* But the name India bore at that time a very wide signification. It was sometimes applied to parts of Arabia and Ethiopia (comp. Philostorg. h. e. II. 6); and Jerome, Ep. 148, seems to refer the tradition respecting Thomas to Ethiopia. The earlier testimonies, however, together with the data furnished by the history of modern missions, point rather to that region which now goes under the name of India, as the field of the apostle's labors.[1] According to a reliable account in Eusebius V. 10, and Jerome De vir. ill. c. 36, *Pantaenus* of Alexandria (§ 59), towards the end of the second century, travelled as far east as India, preaching to the eastern nations, having been preceded by Bartholomew, who had carried Christianity thither, and had left behind him the Gospel of Matthew in a Hebrew version, which Pantaenus found still in existence. It is however somewhat doubtful whether, in these accounts, East India be meant, or a part of Arabia Felix. Lastly, in (northern) *Arabia* the apostle Paul resided some time (§ 15); in the third century Origen of Alexandria labored there for a while, invited thither, according to Eusebius, VI. 19, by an ἡγούμενος τῆς Ἀραβίας,—probably a Dux Arabiae under the Roman sway. At a still later period, Origen sustained intimate relations to the Arabian churches.

---

[1] The city Mayilapur on the coast of Coromandel, near Madras, is still called

2. Europe. The apostle Paul and his companions had carried the gospel to *Greece*, and the adjacent regions, but *Rome* was naturally the central point from which Christianity would spread in Europe. A church must have soon arisen in this metropolis of the world, the existence of which is already recognized in Paul's Epistle to the Romans.[1] Paul and Peter labored at Rome (§ 14, 15), and tradition has preserved several names of the first successive Roman pastors (Linus, Anacletus, [Cletus], Clemens,—see Irenaeus Adv. Haer. III. 3; Euseb. V. 6; III. 2, 4, 15). The chronology is, however, evidently confused and uncertain (compare Consti-

---

by the Christians *Bait Toma*, by the Arabs *Bethuma* (domus Thomae); as the place where the apostle Thomas is supposed to have suffered martyrdom.

[1] The origin of the most distinguished of the ancient churches, is the most obscure of all. When Paul wrote to the church at Rome, about 57 or 58, it had been in existence for some time (Rom. i. 8; xvi. 19), and judging from the contents of the Epistle, consisted of both Jewish and Gentile Christians. There is not the slightest trace of the apostolic origin of this church; on the contrary, the matter and manner of Paul's Epistle would indicate that it had been planted by others than the apostles themselves. Perhaps that numerous body of Jews who belonged to the Roman army, and dwelt across the Tiber in a district by themselves, and who kept up their intercourse with Palestine, were the occasion of the gospel being planted there by the "strangers of Rome" (Acts ii. 10) present on the day of Pentecost, or still later by Adronicus and Junia, Paul's fellow-prisoners who "were of note among the apostles and in Christ before him" (Rom. xvi. 7). Rom. xvi. 3 shows that Aquila and Priscilla labored in the gospel in this city.

tutt. Apostol. VII. 43; Augustine Ep. 53). As early as the second half of the second century we find flourishing churches in *Gaul*, at Lyons and Vienne, upon whose formation colonies from Asia Minor seem to have exercised a prominent influence, and whose bishop Irenaeus (§ 58) has left some accounts respecting the further spread of Christianity in Gaul at that time. About the middle of the third century, according to the statement of Gregory of Tours, seven Christian teachers came into Gaul from Rome and planted churches. One of these, Saturninus by name, according to an account of his martyrdom written about 300, founded a church at Toulouse; another, named Dionysius, in whom a later legend would find the Areopagite of Athens (Acts xvii. 34; comp. § 57), planted the church at Paris. In Irenaeus we also find accounts of the spread of Christianity in *Spain and Germany*. The gospel, in all probability, had been preached in Spain, even though it were but for a very short time, by St. Paul (§ 15), and it would easily pass over into Germania Cisrhenana (Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. I. 10) owing to the close connection with Rome. But besides this, according to Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. III. 4), Christianity seems to have found an entrance even into Germania Transrhenana. And, lastly, Tertullian at the close of the second century (Adv. Judd. c. 7) speaks of the spread of Christianity in *Britain*, and that too not merely in the portion conquered by the Romans; while there is an English tradition handed down by the venerable Bede, to the effect that at the invitation of a British king Lucius, in the last half of the second century, the Romish bishop Eleutherus sent missionaries to Britain. The agreement of the usages of the British Church with those of Asia Minor, however, points rather to an Asia Minor, than a Roman, origin of the Old British church.[1]

3. AFRICA.[2] *Egypt* was the point of departure for Chris-

---

[1] Theile Comm de Eccl. Britannicae primordiis. Usher Britannicae Ecclesiae Antiquitates. Lingard Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon church. Weber Geschichte der akathol. Kirchen u. Secten von Groszbritannien. Wilkins Concilia Brit. et Hibern. Jamieson Historical account of the Culdees. Stillingfleet Origines Britannicae.

[2] Münter Primordia Ecclesiae Africanae.

tianity in Africa. The gospel could speedily pass from Jerusalem to *Alexandria* (Apollos was an Alexandrian § 15), owing to the intimate intercourse between the Palestinian and Alexandrine Jews. A tradition, in Eusebius II. 16, designates Mark the Evangelist as the founder of the church at Alexandria. From this city Christianity very early spread into *Cyrene*, and in the second and third centuries the *Copts* received it through the Greek colonists from Egypt. Of the spread of Christianity in *Ethiopia* or *Abyssinia*, we have no reliable accounts. The conversion of the treasurer of Candace queen of Meroë, by the deacon Philip (Acts viii. 28 seq.), carried it thither. All *Proconsular Africa*, and particularly *Carthage*, was soon and very generally Christianized, owing to the close connection with Rome; and in the second and third centuries Christianity had become so widely spread in *Mauritania* and *Numidia* that Cyprian, bishop of Carthage († 258), could convene a synod of 87 bishops.

§ 19.

CAUSES AND FURTHERANCES OF THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.[1]

The antagonism between the earnest spirit of the gospel, and the resisting spirit of the world, must inevitably oppose many hindrances to the spread of Christianity. There were hindrances arising from the very nature of Christianity itself, which, particularly pure at that time, required and produced an entire renunciation of the world, and a total denial of self in every degree, even to the surrendry of life. There were hindrances springing from the fact that the Christian religion had taken its origin from a dispersed nation, had been diffused by despised individuals, and had been received chiefly by the poorer classes,—from the fact of the very close interweaving of the old pagan religions with the whole fabric of social, civil, and literary life, — and, lastly, from the fact of the recently awakened religious and political effort in the pagan world to uphold the ancient religion, together with the existence of fanaticism and magic of every sort, called out by the active but unsatisfied religious aspirations of the time. In opposition to all these hindrances, there were, in particular, two causes which, in connection with the glowing zeal and entire consecration of the *preacher* of Christianity, resulted in the rapid and triumphant spread of the Christian religion. These were: the *internal divine power* by which Christianity renovated and changed the individual character; and the *external tokens of divine power*, by which the glorified Redeemer, constantly present with his church, gave miraculous testimony to the supernatural origin of the gospel, and thus prepared the way for faith in it.

---

[1] Compare with this analysis that of Gibbon Decline and Fall, Chapter XV

The early Christians evinced by their walk and conversation that the whole inner man had been renewed by the power of the Holy Ghost. The most illiterate men (Tertull. Apol. c. 46) spoke of God, and divine things, and eternal life, with a clearness and confidence, the like of which one would seek in vain in the best schools of philosophy. The daily life of the seemingly most wretched of mankind, irradiated by an inward serenity and joy, of which the resignation of the philosopher was only a poor shadow and mimicry, — the mingled heroism and gentleness, under the most dreadful tortures, of even tender youths and delicate females, who refused to renounce Christ to the last gasp of life, till the flame consumed them and the lion tore them, — was a surer testimony for the truth of Christian doctrines than the finest words of the cultivated pagan could ever be, (Tertull. Apol. c. 50). And, in an age when rigid selfishness, slavish fear of man, and enervating licentiousness penetrated and poisoned all the relations of life, how could that cordial brotherly-love,[1] that invincible refusal to do even the slightest thing in opposition to the gospel at the command of man, that intense and even ascetic strictness of morals,—how, in such an age, could the entire saintly life of the early Christians, which shone forth not less illustriously in the love and conscientiousness of the once disobedient and disorderly slave (Tertull. Apol. c. 2), than in the noble and cultivated pagan convert, fail to overcome the opposition of many, so that even the most wicked and obstinate enemies of Christianity were converted, subdued by the example of Christian virtue, which they saw before their own eyes in the daily intercourse of life (Justin. Mart. Apol. II. p. 63)!

---

[1] Tertull. Apol. c. 39. Vide, inquiunt, ut invicem se diligant. Ipsi enim invicem oderunt. Et ut pro alterutro mori sint parati. Ipsi enim ad occidendum alterutrum paratiores.

In addition to all this, there were external acts of divine power proving the divinity of Christianity. At the name of Jesus the sick were healed, devils were driven out, the dead were brought to life,—a miraculous power employed not solely by the apostles, but one that is referred to, as still exerted before the eyes of the heathen themselves as eye-witnesses, by Justin Martyr (Apol. I. p. 45. ed. Col.), Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. II. 22), Tertullian, and even the highly educated and truth-loving Origen (Con. Cels. I. 46; I. 67; II. 8; II. 33; III. 24; VII. 4; VII. 8).[1] These causes combined, account for the remarkably rapid spread of Christianity.

---

[1] For all the passages from Origen, relating to the continuance of miraculous power, see Guericke Commentatio de Schola Alex. P. II. pp. 270-272. The passages from other fathers are given in La Rue's Origen Con. Cels. I. 2. p. 321, note a; and also in Neander I. pp. 72-75.

CHAPTER SECOND.

OPPOSITION TO CHRISTIANITY.

§ 20.

JEWISH PERSECUTION.

The Jews were the first persecutors of the Christians. On the first appearance of Christianity, Judaism was split into two sections, and from one of them, constituting a false Judaism, the opposition proceeded. The true and spiritual Israel joyfully accepted the Messiah, and thus Israel, the corporeal and spiritual seed of Abraham, the ancient people of God, became the basis and root of the Christian church, as it had been destined to be from the beginning. The first members of the church were believers from Israel according to the flesh; original branches of the holy stock, upon which the heathen were grafted only *παρὰ φύσιν*. But the Judaism of those who rejected their Messiah had lost its original divine character, and rested upon an ungodly, unspiritual, base. This false Judaism (Rom. iii. 28), henceforth stood in the most violent opposition to that divine decree which had promised blessings to the race of Abraham only *in Christ*, and cherished an implacable enmity towards Christianity, that was restricted in its manifestations only by the powerlessness of these Jews and their outcast condition among the nations.

The multitude of believers at Jerusalem, "of one heart and of one soul," had, at first, "favor with all the people." But in proportion as the preaching of Peter and the other apostles, sounded with a clearer and louder tone of Christ the Crucified (Acts iii. iv.), the pride of the Pharisee, and the scepticism of the Sadducee, felt itself more severely rebuked and condemned. Soon their wrath broke forth into open attack, and the apostles were imprisoned and scourged (Acts iv. 3; v. 40). The distinct refusal of the apostles to cease preaching Christ, at the bidding of man (Acts v. 29, comp. iv. 19), now awakened bloody purposes (Acts v. 33), which were repressed only through the wise counsel of *Gamaliel* (Acts v. 34 seq.). But only for a season. The suppressed rage against the constantly growing church at length gave itself vent when *Stephen*, one of the recently appointed seven deacons, in the demonstration of the spirit and with power, chastised the obstinate blindness and malice of the Jews. With the entire unanimity of the Sanhedrim and the people, he was stoned to death (Acts vi. vii.),—the first Christian martyr,—only a few years after the ascension of Christ.[1] His death was the signal for a violent persecution of the church (Acts viii. 1 seq.), in which Saul was especially active (§ 15). After some interval, about the year 44, Herod Agrippa, in order to win favor with the Jews, again spilt the blood of the Christians. The apostle *James the elder* was beheaded; and only the angel of God saved *Peter* from the same fate (Acts xii.). Lastly, not long before the breaking out of the Jewish war, *Paul*, who had previously often experienced minor persecutions (§ 15), and *James the younger*, who now suffered martyrdom (§ 16), incurred the deadly hostility of the Jews. In the year 70, the divine judgment, preceded by terrible signs and sufferings, fell upon the Jewish metropolis, as Christ had foretold forty years before the event. The Romans under *Titus* captured the city, after a siege of four months, in which eleven hundred thousand of the inhabitants perished.[2] Jerusalem, with the temple, became a heap of ruins; being levelled even with the ground by fire and shovel, while the company of Christian believers were praising God for their safety in the little city of Pella beyond Jordan, whither in the year 66 they had taken refuge on the approach of the Roman army, — remembering the prophetic declarations of their Lord respecting the doomed city, and also, according to Eusebius (III. 5), receiving other divine instructions.

---

[1] In the year 35 or 36; see § 15.

[2] Josephus, De Bello Jud. lib. III.-VII.; Tacitus, Hist. V.; Eusebius, III. 5 seq.

The Christians once more felt the hatred of the Jews during the reign of the emperor *Hadrian.* Enraged, because upon the site of their ancient metropolis a Roman colony, in the year 126, had established itself under the name of Aelia Capitolina, and had built a temple to Jupiter, the Jews, under the lead of their pseudo-Messiah, *Barcochba*, once more revolted against the Roman government, and commenced a warfare bloody in the extreme, and one that resulted in their own total overthrow. During these years of rebellion, from 132 to 135, all those Christians who fell into the hands of the Jews and refused to renounce Christ and take part in the revolt were subjected to the most horrible tortures. This, however, was the last *independent* act of hatred towards Christianity on the part of Judaism; yet, in all the succeeding pagan persecutions, the Jews, now scattered throughout the whole world, distinguished themselves by rendering an eager assistance to the Gentile enemies of Christianity.

Pagan Persecution

Lactantius De mortibus persecutorum. Kortholt Paganus obtrectator; De persecutt. eccles. primaevae. Baldunii Commentar. ad edicta vett. princc. Romm. de Christianis. Martini Persecutiones Christianorum. Sagittarius De martyrum cruciatibus. Tzschirner Der Fall des Heidenthums. Gibbon Decline and Fall, Chapter XVI. Mosheim Commentaries, in locis.

§ 21.

CAUSES OF PERSECUTION WITHIN THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

Persecutions of Christians in the Roman empire proceeded partly from the state authorities, partly from the populace, and partly from individuals. They were sometimes the deliberate deductions from the principles of the state-religion which must not be violated with impunity, sometimes the result of rude outbreaks of popular rage which attributed all existing evils to the Christians, and sometimes they flowed from the refined malignity of individuals whose private interests were anti-Christian.

1. The ancient religions were religions of a particular people and state. Hence among the Romans, by the laws of the Twelve Tables, (Cicero De legg. II. 8), any religious worship that had not been publicly sanctioned was penally forbidden. The practice of their own religion had been allowed to the Jews by a special privilege, as was also, from policy, the case with the religions of all conquered nations; but particular statutes were sometimes passed to forbid a Roman citizen from embracing Judaism (Tacit. Ann. II. 85), and only after its formal reception among the religiones licitas, did even the growing eclecticism of the time permit a foreign ceremonial to be employed by Roman citizens. The adoption and spread of any religio illicita, especially in an age so suspicious as was that of the emperors towards all innovations and intimate associations, was equivalent to a breach of the law of the land; but a religio illicita like the Christian, novel, not pertaining to any one nation, without temple, altar, or sacrifice, by its claims excluding all other religions, and characterized by the most thorough union of its votaries, must have been an object of extreme suspicion. The invincible steadfastness of the Christians in their own belief, in opposition to all human authority, their determined refusal to engage in the ceremonies of the Roman state-religion even when demanded only as a civil duty incumbent upon all citizens, their refusal to scatter incense superstitiously before the busts of the emperors as merely the expression of the subject's reverence for his ruler, or to take part in pagan and sinful festivities on the birth-days of the emperors or at the celebration of a victory, their partial declining to serve in the armies of heathen generals,—all this must have appeared in that despotic age as particularly dangerous,

nay as "inflexibilis obstinatio" against the government; as the sentiment and disposition of decided "hostes Caesarum et populi Romani."

2. Very many persecutions however had no special connection with the Roman government, but proceeded from the populace. Since the Christians rejected the national divinities, the people looked upon them as totally godless and detestable men, *ἄθεοι*, concerning whom they readily believed the most horrible accusations, — such as that they practised abominable and even unnatural vices in their assemblages; that they killed their offspring and ate human flesh. Moreover, as all epidemics, droughts, and famines, were regarded as effects of the wrath of the gods against their enemies and despisers,[1] these public calamities were continually furnishing occasions for popular attacks upon the Christians.

3. Lastly, many persecutions were excited by individuals, — heathen priests, sellers of images (Acts xix. 24 seq.), magicians (like Alexander of Abonitichus in the 2nd century), and such like persons, — with whose interests the spirit of the gospel and its confessors was in sharpest contrast, and who eagerly availed themselves of the prevailing temper of the populace and the government to carry out their own revenge.

§ 22.

PERSECUTIONS TO THE REIGN OF NERVA.

Only fragmentary materials remain, from which to derive a view of the relations which the first Roman emperors sustained to the Christian religion and church.

1. *Tiberius*, *A. D.* 14–37. According to one tradition, the

---

[1] A common saying was "non pluit Deus, duc ad Christianos." Tertullian (Apol. c. 40) remarks: "Si Tiberis ascendit in moenia, si Nilus non ascendit in arva, si coelum stetit, si terra movit, si fames, si lues, statim Christianos ad leonem!"

emperor of the world was brought into connection with the affairs of the church as early as the time of Christ's death. Tertullian (Apologeticus c. 5. 21) relates that Tiberius, disturbed by the official report of Pilate, particularly with respect to the resurrection of Christ, proposed to the senate that Jesus should be enrolled among the deos Romanos, but, on their refusal, contented himself with threatening punishment towards all who should bring accusations against the Christians. This account cannot be arbitrarily rejected, as merely a popular tradition without any sort of foundation. It does not seem incredible, if we carefully take into account the character of Tiberius, who, frequently, when tortured by conscience and disturbed by some momentary impression, pestered the senate with hasty propositions. The threat of punishment, also, may have been only the result of a sudden impulse, and hence without further consequences.

2. *Claudius*, *A. D.* 41–54. According to Suetonius (Claud. c. 25),[1] corroborated by Acts xviii. 2, the emperor Claudius banished the Jews from Rome. If there were Christians there at that time, it is highly probable that they were included in this banishment, since no very clear distinction was made between Jews and Christians by the Roman world until after the destruction of Jerusalem. Moreover, if there were Christians at Rome at this time they were most probably converted Jews.

3. *Nero*, *A. D.* 54–68. The first Christian persecution, proper, in the Roman empire, broke out under Nero in the year 64. The occasion of it was a terrible conflagration in Rome, of nine days continuance, which was very generally attributed to the emperor, but which was by him charged upon the Christians of whom the populace readily believed the worst.[2] Many were seized and put to death with horri-

---

[1] The statement of Suetonius, made up, in all probability, partly from indefinite reports concerning Jesus, and partly from his knowledge of the restless temper of the Jews expecting a Messiah, is as follows: Claudius Judaeos impulsore Christo assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.

[2] Even Tacitus, the principal authority in this instance, speaks of them as men per flagitia invisos, and characterized by an exitiabilis superstitio and an odium generis humani (Annal. XV. 44.)

ble tortures; were sown up in the skins of wild beasts and then torn to pieces by dogs; were smeared with wax and pitch and then burnt as torches to give light by night in the imperial gardens. The persecution in all probability spread from the city into the provinces; an ancient inscription expressly mentions Spain as one. This persecution, during the latter part of which Paul and Peter suffered martyrdom (§ 14, 15), came to an end on the suicide of Nero. A report, however, spread among the Christians that Nero was not dead in reality, but had only withdrawn himself beyond the Euphrates, in order to reappear as Antichrist.

4. *Domitian, A. D.* 81–96. According to Tertullian (Apol. c. 5), Domitian planned a persecution of the Christians but did not execute it. Hegesippus (Euseb. III. 19, 20), makes the same statement, and relates that the emperor, hearing of "the kingdom of Christ," and misapprehending the phrase in a political sense, summoned two of the kindred of Jesus from Palestine to Rome for examination, but soon released them on finding that they were not suspicious persons. Yet, according to Dion Cassius Hist. LXVII. 14, and Eusebius, who follows an earlier account in his Chronicle, individuals were persecuted, upon the charge of being Christians, by the suspicious and avaricious emperor shortly before his death; some of whom were condemned to death, and others to have their goods confiscated, and to be sent into exile.

5. *Nerva, A. D.* 96—98. Dion Cassius relates that the "good" emperor Nerva recalled the exiles, and allowed no one of his subjects to bring accusations against another on account of *ἀσέβεια* or of *βίος ἰουδαϊκός*, and especially forbade the reception of charges of slaves against their masters. Yet with all this indirect favor, Christianity, as heretofore, still continued to be a religio illicita.

§ 23.

PERSECUTIONS UNDER TRAJAN, HADRIAN, AND ANTONINUS PIUS.

1. *Trajan, A. D.* 98—117. The emperor Trajan not only occasioned new persecutions of the Christians, by a law that forbade secret associations, and which was aimed primarily against the Hetaerae, but this otherwise upright and noble prince was the *first who enacted a distinct penal statute against the Christians;* of which the malice of their enemies, of late restrained now eagerly availed itself. The younger Pliny, as proconsul over Bithynia and Pontus, became involved in judicial procedures against the Christians, and finding their numbers to be great,[1]—an anonymous bill of accusations, containing many names, having been given in to him,—wrote to the emperor (Epp. X. 96, al. 97), for instructions in the case. He reported, in his account of them, that the closest questioning, even of apostates from Christianity, and of Christian female slaves under the rack, had brought to light no crime properly chargeable upon the sect. They all came together early in the morning, on a particular day, sang hymns of praise to Christ as their God,[2] pledged themselves to avoid all that was evil,[3] and in the evening partook of a simple meal: this was all that he could discover, and on this account their religion appeared to him to be only a "superstitio prava et immodica." Still, he thought public disobedience of the regulations of the Roman state ought not to go unpunished. Whoever should obstinately refuse to sacrifice to the gods, to scatter incense upon the emperor's statue, and to blaspheme Christ, he was of opinion, ought

---

[1] Multi,—says Pliny,—omnis aetatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus etiam vocantur in periculum et vocabuntur; neque enim civitates tantum, sed vicos etiam atque agros superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est.

[2] Quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere secum invicem.

[3] Ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent.

to be punished with death; but he who should recant should be set free. With these views and propositions the emperor fully agreed in his answer, (Plin. Ep. X. 97 al. 98). He ordered that the Christians should not be sought out by the government, but in case they had otherwise been delivered up, and had been convicted, they should suffer punishment;[1] and custom had made this, death by the sword. Many victims fell, particularly in Syria and Palestine. *Simeon*, the venerable bishop of the church at Jerusalem, the successor of James, an aged man of 120 years, and a near relative of the Lord, died (in 107) a martyr's death upon the cross (Euseb. III. 32), witnessing a joyful confession after many days previous scourging. The excellent bishop *Ignatius* of Antioch, after a trial before the emperor, was thrown to the lions in the Colossaeum, in the year 116 (Euseb. III. 22, 36; Jerome, Catal. c. 16; Acta martyrii Ignatiani).

2. *Hadrian, A. D.*, 117—138. The condition of the Christians was not much improved under Hadrian. The attacks of the populace upon them, led Serennius Granianus, proconsul of Asia Minor, to represent their case to the emperor, who, in his rescript to Granianus's successor, Minucius Fundanus, declared (Euseb., IV. 9) that not popular clamor, but only judicial accusation, should be valid against the Christians; that punishment should be inflicted in case of proved opposition to the laws, — an evidence that Christianity was still a religio illicita, — but that false accusers should be punished also. According to Aelius Lampridius (Alex. Sev. c. 24), Hadrian formed the design, which was frustrated only by the pagan priests, of building a temple to Christ, and enrolling him among the deos Romanos; but this witness from the 4th century is not sufficient authority for this statement, if we take into account Hadrian's great zeal for the Roman Sacra, and his contempt of all Sacra perigrina (Comp. Spartiani vita Hardr. c. 22; Vopisci Saturninus c. 8), together

---

[1] "Conquirendi non sunt: si deferantur et arguantur, puniendi sunt; ita tamen, ut qui negaverit se Christianum esse idque re ipsa manifestum fecerit, veniam, ex penitentia impetret. Sine auctore vero propositi libelli nullo crimine locum habere debent."

with his actual desecration of the holy places of the Christians.

3. *Antoninus Pius, A. D.* 138–161. This emperor, in various rescripts to Grecian states (Euseb., IV. 26), declared against mob-violence towards the Christians, which during his reign had been called out anew by famine, earthquakes, inundations, and conflagrations. More than this, he also sought to afford them protection in case of judicial accusation. In a rescript addressed to the convention of imperial deputies of Asia Minor, he even lays down the position that the Christians are not punishable on the score of their religion;[1] an ordinance, indeed, that must be of only temporary effect so long as Christianity was not held to be a religio licita.

§ 24.

PERSECUTION UNDER MARCUS AURELIUS (ANTONINUS PHILOSOPHUS). A. D. 161–180.

The condition of the Christians grew much worse during the rule of the renowned Marcus Aurelius, who, as a Stoic philosopher, was neither able nor inclined to set a proper estimate upon the Christian religion; disliking particularly the Christian enthusiasm (see his Monol. XI. 3), and anxious, from political reasons, to preserve intact the old religion of the State. His law (in the Pandects) condemning the propagators of religious superstition to exile, probably had reference to Christians. More severe yet were the "new edicts," respecting which Melito bishop of Sardis complains in his Apology (Euseb., IV. 26), but which have not come down to us. From the character of the persecutions at this time, — which were different from the earlier, in that *individual Christians were searched out, and compelled by torture to*

---

[1] Euseb., IV. 13, where this rescript is erroneously attributed to Marcus Aurelius. The genuineness of this document is disputed upon insufficient grounds.

renounce their religion, — we may infer the contents of these decrees; and it is very probable that an edict, ascribed to Aurelian (in Ruinart. Acta Symphoriani), which requires the "severe yet legal punishment of Christians by tortures of various kinds in order to extirpate the crime," was one of these "new edicts" of Aurelius.

Contemporaneous documents give an account of two particular persecutions under the emperor Aurelius, both of which were distinguished by Christian heroism.

1. Respecting the *persecution at Smyrna*, in 167, a letter from the church at Smyrna to the churches in Pontus (Euseb., IV. 15) relates the following. The proconsul of Asia Minor, endeavored, through entreaties, threats and tortures, to induce the Christians to deny their faith; "flayed by scourging so that all their muscles and arteries were laid bare, placed upon sharp-pointed spikes, etc., the martyrs remained firm," and whoever remained firm was thrown to the wild beasts. The venerable bishop Polycarp, a disciple of the apostle John, met his death at this time (on Easter Sabbath, perhaps in 168). Having spent many days previous in prayer, and after he had affectionately entertained his persecutor as his guest, he was pierced through with a sword while tied to the stake, since the flames failed to consume him; refusing "to curse the Lord whom he had served eighty-six years," and praising God with joyful heart "that he had been deemed worthy to be numbered among Christ's witnesses, and to share in the cup of Christ's sufferings." After Polycarp's martyrdom the proconsul made no further search for Christians.

2. Respecting the *persecution at Lyons and Vienne*, in the year 177, we have an account in a letter from these churches to those of Asia Minor (Euseb., V. 1–3). Even previous to the actual outbreak of this persecution, Christians could not show themselves in public without maltreatment; their houses were plundered, and all known to be Christians were incarcerated. On the arrival of the imperial legate the inquisition began, accompanied with the most exquisite and horrible tortures. The deacon *Sanctus*, *Attalus* of Pergamus,

"pillars of the church," and others, particularly the young female slave *Blandina*, gave proofs of an almost superhuman Christian heroism. They were tortured with hot plates of brass applied to the most sensitive parts of the body, were dreadfully scourged, were roasted upon a glowing iron chair, were thrown to the wild beasts to be lacerated for a while, and finally, having endured all these and other tortures, sometimes for days together, were put to death. *Blandina* tired out her tormentors, by her endurance of every species of torture from morning till evening, and, with a body lacerated and cut open, received new accessions of spiritual strength and courage as she testified, "I am a Christian and there is no evil done among us." After she and *Ponticus* a youth of fifteen years had daily witnessed the execution of others, they both met the end of martyrs; Blandina having first been again scourged, then tortured by the bites of wild beasts and the red-hot iron chair, and, lastly, exposed in a net to the horns of a wild ox. These two were the last victims of this persecution. The aged bishop *Pothinus* had already departed, having been subjected to the greatest tortures in a most loathsome prison, in which others of his fellow-prisoners had suffocated. Those Christians who possessed the rights of Roman citizenship were, by an imperial decision, beheaded. The corpses of the "army of martyrs" lay unburied for a time, and were subjected to indignities of various sorts. They were, at length, collected and burnt; and, in order to absolutely prevent their resurrection, as the persecutors supposed, the ashes were thrown into the Rhone.

According to contemporaneous accounts (Comp. Euseb. V. 5), the occurrence connected with the legio fulminea, in the war against the Marcommanni and Quades, in the year 174, produced an alteration of the emperor's feeling towards the Christians, and led him to threaten punishment against those who should bring charges against them. The imperial army, it is related, was saved from impending destruction by the coming on of a terrible storm, slaking the thirst of the fainting soldiers and frightening the enemy, in answer to the prayers of the Christian soldiers of the twelfth legion. The truth of this statement is vouched for by Claudius Apollinaris (Euseb. V. 5) and Tertullian (Apol. c. 5), and all Christian and Pagan writers of antiquity agree at least in this, — that the Roman army was, at the time mentioned, preserved in a very remarkable manner. The objections to the essential credibility of this account do not seem to be of sufficient weight to overthrow it. At any rate, the fact itself of a deliverance in answer to the prayers of Christians is established upon credible testimony, though it is indeed uncertain whether the emperor's feeling towards Christianity was changed thereby. If such were the case, his altered mood continued but a short time, since he soon attributed the aid he had received to his own divinities, or to the "fate" of Stoïcism.

§ 25.

PERSECUTIONS FROM COMMODUS TO PHILIP THE ARABIAN.

After the reign of Marcus Aurelius, the condition of the Christians alternated for a time, finally settling into one of moderate prosperity for a limited period.

Commodus, A. D. 180–192. This emperor, worthless and detestable as he was, showed himself remarkably favorable to the Christians, owing to the influence of Marcia over him. According to Irenaeus, a contemporary, (Adv. Haer. IV. 30), there were Christians in the palace and service of the emperor. Nevertheless there were partial persecutions (Tertull. Ad. Scapul. c. 5), and Irenaeus himself speaks of martyrs at this time (Adv. Haer. IV. 33, 9). A distinguished Roman Christian, Apollonius, was executed; but his accuser, his slave, was also put to death (Euseb. V. 21).

Septimius Severus, A. D. 193–211. Severus was at first favorably inclined towards the Christians, because his Christian slave had cured him of disease (Tertull. Ad. Scapulam, c. 4), but his feeling was soon changed to that of political suspicion. "Daily," so wrote Clemens Alexandrinus (Stromata II. p. 414), not long after the death of Commodus, "do we see many martyrs burned before our eyes, crucified, beheaded;" and the violence of the persecution was increased, on the enactment (A. D. 202) of a strict law prohibiting conversion to Judaism and Christianity. Persecution appears to have raged most virulently in Egypt and Proconsular Africa. At Carthage, *Vivia Perpetua*, of noble birth, a young mother, with her infant in her arms, and her heathen father weeping at her feet, in the exercise of genuine and triumphant faith, became the victim of the wild ox and the gladiator's dagger (Augustine, in Ps. 47). Her companion in faith and suffering, the female slave *Felicitas*, being seized with the pains of labor in the prison, made answer to the mock-pity of the jailor: "It is *I* that suffer now; but then there will be another who will be with me, and suffer for me, because I shall suffer for him." At Alexandria *Potamiäna*, a maiden of noble birth and distinguished beauty, steadfast under all threats of pain and shame, endured to the end, being finally slowly let down into a caldron of boiling pitch (Euseb. VI. 5).

Caracalla, A. D. 211–217. *Heliogabalus, A. D.* 218–222. Under Caracalla persecutions continued in many places; but the monster Heliogabalus, in order to fuse Christianity, together with all other religions, in his Syrian Sun-worship, afforded it toleration (Lamprid. Heliogab. c. 3).

Alexander Severus, A. D. 222–235. This estimable ruler adopted Christianity as one element in his Platonic eclecticism. The busts of Abraham, Orpheus, Apollonius of Tyana, and Jesus, stood beside each other in his Lararium (Lamprid., Alex. Sev. c. 29), and he is said to have entertained the design of erecting a temple to Christ. He was the son of a worthy mother, Julia Mammaea, the patroness of Origen (Euseb. VI. 21). Yet Christianity was not a religio licita, and Domitius Ulpianus, (De officio proconsulis), in this reign made a collection of the rescripts of the earlier emperors against the Christians.

Maximin, A. D. 235–238. *Gordian, A. D.* 238–244. *Philip, A. D.* 244–249. From hatred towards his predecessor, Maximin the Thracian was an enemy to the Christians, and the popular rage was also awakened against them by the occurrence of dreadful earthquakes. Nevertheless they enjoyed tranquillity in many parts of the empire. This tranquillity increased during the reign of Gordian, and particularly during that of Philip the Arabian, who openly favored the Christians, and is even reported to have become a Christian himself (Euseb. VI. 34, and Chronicle). Yet the earliest pretended account of this event (Dionys. Alex., in Euseb. VII. 10) is altogether indirect and uncertain, and in both the public and private life of this emperor we see the heathen in manifold ways. Moreover, Origen, who corresponded by letter with Philip and his consort Severa, says nothing of a confession of Christianity by a Roman emperor, in his great apologetic work.

§ 26.

PERSECUTIONS FROM DECIUS TO DIOCLETIAN.

Decius, *A. D.* 249–251. In proportion as this period of rest had rendered the church somewhat unused to conflict, the deeper was the impression made by the new baptism of fire, the persecution under Decius, which exceeded all the previous ones in extent and cruelty, and aimed at the entire extinction of Christianity. From the contemporaneous accounts of it, in Cyprian's letters and in Dionysius of Alexandria (Euseb. VI. 40–42), we can infer the contents of the imperial edict. At an appointed time, all Christians, in every province of the empire, must appear and offer sacrifice in public. Those who fled were sentenced to perpetual banishment, and their property was confiscated. The attempt was made, by explanations, threats, and the most exquisite and prolonged tortures, to induce those who remained to deny the faith. Many of those who refused, particularly the bishops and church officers generally, were executed. The preceding period of tranquillity had rendered many Christians, especially the rich and noble, lukewarm and sluggish. Many actually offered sacrifice (sacrificati) and incense (thurificati), while others purchased from the government officer a certificate of having complied with the edict (libellatici). All such were regarded as having denied Christ, and were excommunicated as lapsi. Yet there were not wanting distinguished examples of the heroism of the Christian martyr, of every age and sex. Cyprian of Carthage was obliged to moderate the zeal of the crowds who sought incarceration in the prisons of the confessores; and a number of Roman Christians, after having endured tortures of every kind, and languishing in prison, expecting a martyr-death, regarded their lot as a glorious one (Cypr. Epp. 4, 18, 26). Decius finally perished, a few years after his entrance upon his dreadful reign, in a war with the Goths.

Gallus, *A. D.* 251–253. Under this emperor the Christians found as yet no perfect quiet. He himself, against his inclination, was hindered by the political troubles of the empire from continuing the bloody work of his predecessor, but a pestilence excited the popular fury. Two Roman bishops, Cornelius and Lucius, suffered martyrdom. At Carthage, the generous conduct of Cyprian and his church (Vita Cypriani per Pontium), in burying, at the risk of their own lives, the heaps of corpses, and thereby saving the city from the universal spread of the disease, seems to have appeased the pagan rage.

Valerian, *A. D.* 254–259. Valerian at first showed himself so favorable towards the Christians that his palace, according to Dionysius of Alexandria, was like a church; but through the influence of his favorite Macrianus he became their persecutor, and formed a deliberate plan to destroy the Church (Dionysius, in Euseb. VII. 10, 11). His first edict, A. D. 257, commanded exiling of the clergy, particularly the bishops, and forbade the assembling of Christians upon pain of death. But bishops, like Cyprian of Carthage and Dionysius of Alexandria, continued to pursue their Christian labors in exile, with as great success as ever. Hence, in 258, a second edict was proclaimed (Cypr. Ep. 82). All bishops, presbyters, and deacons, were to be put to death immediately; Christian senators were to be deprived of their dignities and offices, and, in case of refusal to apostatize, of their lives. In this persecution the Roman bishop Sixtus and his four deacons were the first martyrs. Cyprian also suffered martyrdom by the sword, in the province of Carthage, Sept. 14, 258, condemned by the proconsul as "the enemy of the gods, and the head of an unlawful association." He met death with great tranquillity and joy, thanking God for the testimony he was permitted to bear, having previously sent an affectionate farewell letter to his church (Ep. 83). His church were allowed to pay the last offices of love and reverence to the corpse. The attempt was made to compel multitudes of Christians of every rank, age, and sex, to deny the faith, by scourging, and severe labors in the mines. Yet all this force and artifice was in vain. In the year 259 the emperor was taken captive by the Persians, and the persecution ceased.

Gallienus, A. D. 259—268. *Aurelian, A. D.* 270—275. Gallienus, the son of Valerian, immediately upon his accession to the throne guaranteed to the Christians, by an edict (Euseb. VII. 13), in which he recognized the Christian church to be a lawfully established institution, full liberty and security in the practice of their religion; and thus Christianity was at last elevated to the position of a religio licita. By this act, evil-disposed emperors were now hindered in their designs, and even the enmity of an Aurelian found no opportunity to give itself vent. He, too, recognized the Christian church to be a lawful society, and only at the very close of his reign (A. D. 275), signed an edict for a new persecution of the Christians, which was however not carried into effect owing to his assassination. During the forty years of general quiet since the Decian persecution, Christianity had spread and prospered without opposition, in order then to pass through one more severe conflict with heathenism in its last rage and fury of persecution.

§ 27.

THE DIOCLETIAN PERSECUTION.[1]

The emperor Diocletian (284—305) shared the government till the year 292 with Maximianus Herculius, and both then shared it with the two Caesars, Constantius Chlorus, and Caius Galerius, the violent enemy of the Christians. For some time after his accession, Diocletian was tolerant toward Christianity; not indeed from personal inclination, since his law against the Manichaeans, in the year 296, evinces the most decided and exclusive bias towards the old paganism; but from craft and policy, on account of the now legalized position of the Christian body, the great number of Christians, the fact that all persecution hitherto had only furthered the progress of Christianity, and perhaps, also, from a feeling of humanity. At length the unwearied and urgent solicitations of Galerius prevailed over his aged and infirm father-in-law. The order issued in 298, that all soldiers should take part in the sacrifices, which led many Christians to leave the army, was only the single forerunner of the persecution which commenced in the year 303, on the occasion of a meeting between Galerius and Diocletian at Nicomedia in Bithynia. On the 23d of February, on a pagan festival, the splendid church at Nicomedia was torn down, and the manuscript copies of the Scriptures, preserved in it, were burnt. Soon after, and in many places upon Easter-day, the imperial edict was proclaimed, that all religious assemblages of Christians should be dispersed, all Christian churches should be destroyed, all copies of the Scriptures should be delivered up and burnt, all recusant Christians should be deprived of their civil dignities and rights, all Christian slaves should lose forever the hope of manumission, and the rack should be applicable, without any distinction, at the judicial trial of any Christian who should refuse to renounce his faith (Euseb. VIII. 2, together with Rufinus's translation; and De mortt. perss. c. 13). A Christian, in mistaken zeal, tore down the edict, and was put to death. Soon after, a fire broke out in the emperor's palace; Galerius accused the Christians of kindling it, and caused a number of them to be arrested, and put to the torture. Lactantius asserts that Galerius himself was the incendiary. According to Constantine (Oratio ad sanctor. coet. c. 25), the fire was caused by lightning; according to Eusebius, the cause was not known. Only a portion of the Christians consented to deliver up copies of the Scriptures for destruction; and these were excommunicated as traditores. Those on the contrary who refused, and whose consciences would not permit them to palm off upon the government officials the writings of heretics, in the place of the canonical writings, were, in accordance with this edict, and two other special imperial orders issued afterwards, maltreated in every possible way by their pagan enemies. A revolt in Syria furnished Galerius a new opportunity to raise new and heavy charges against the Christians; and now the second edict went through all the provinces, that all the clergy should be imprisoned as politically suspicious persons (Euseb. VIII. 6). Soon the prisons were full, and then was issued the third edict, that all should be compelled, in every mode possible, to offer sacrifice. This order was made to include all Christians, by a fourth edict issued in 304 (Euseb. De martyribus Palaestinae, c. 3).

---

[1] See Historia Eccl. VIII.–X. of Eusebius, who was a contemporary; and the contemporaneous work of Lactantius, De mortibus persecutorum, c. 7. sqq.

Now began the culmination of the most protracted and bloody of all the Christian persecutions. There was no restraint imposed in regard to the taking of life, and the pagan persecutor raged with an unbridled barbarity that baffles description. It was as if the very wild beasts themselves were shocked by the enormities committed; so writes Eusebius (VIII. 7), an eye-witness of remarkable instances in which, particularly in Phenicia, the persecutors sought in vain to make the Christians the raven of untamed animals. Bears and panthers recoiled from the martyrs. Man then invented tortures more than brutal. At the very commencement of the persecution, Peter, a Christian connected with the imperial court at Nicomedia, had his flesh scourged off to the bones (Euseb. VIII. 6); then salt and vinegar were poured into the wounds; and finally, as he continued steadfast, he was slowly burnt to death before a fire. It was at length found too tedious to put Christians to death one by one, and great fires were made in order to destroy whole multitudes at a time. Sometimes they tied the victim to a mill-stone and sank him in the sea. In order to cut off all opportunity for a just trial, altars were erected in the courts of the judgment halls, upon which all who would obtain a hearing must first offer sacrifice. In *Egypt*, entire families of Christians, after having first endured racking tortures, were destroyed by fire, water, and the sword. Some were killed by hunger, others by crucifixion; of the latter, many were crucified with the head downward, being left in this position until they died with hunger (Euseb. VIII. 8). In *Alexandria*, — so relates Phileas bishop of Thmuis, who was himself a prisoner at the time, and afterwards suffered martyrdom (Euseb. VIII. 10), — Christians were fastened upon a machine and all their limbs were wrenched asunder. In other instances the torturers lacerated the entire body, — sides, abdomen, legs, and cheeks, — with iron spikes. Others were suspended by one arm, and then all their joints were torn apart. Others still, were hung up in chains in such way that the feet could not touch the ground, in order that the chains might cut the flesh more deeply and painfully. In some instances the tortured were carefully nursed and their wounds healed, in order that they might be put to torture again. In *Thebais* (Euseb. VIII. 9), Christians were lacerated with muscle-shells over the whole body, until they died. Gentle and delicate women were exposed nude to public insult; were fastened between branches of trees bent together, and were then torn in sunder by their rebound. And all this went on year after year! Ten, thirty, sixty, nay a hundred confessors were slain at a time; men, women, and children. "The very swords themselves," says Eusebius (VIII. 9), "at length became blunt and broken, being worn out with use; the executioners grew weary, and gave over their function; but the Christians, till the last breath of life, sang songs of praise and thanksgiving to almighty God." In *Pontus*, the torturers pierced the fingers of Christians through and through with sharp awls, from the end of the nail downwards; poured along upon their backs melted lead glowing and bubbling with heat, not to speak of other equally dreadful, as well as indecent, tortures (Euseb. VIII. 12). Christian maidens were not seldom exposed to a dishonor worse than death, and from which they sometimes took refuge in suicide; an act upon which, in view of the circumstances, the church itself was inclined to look with leniency (Euseb. VIII. 12, 14). In *Antioch*, Christians were consumed by a slow fire; in *Cappadocia*, their legs were broken; in *Mesopotamia*, they were suspended by the feet, and a slow suffocating fire made at their heads (Euseb. VIII. 12). In *Phrygia*, a whole Christian town was surrounded by a cordon of armed men, then set on fire, and all the inhabitants with their wives and children were forced to burn (Euseb. VIII. 11). When at length the persecutors had become weary of murder, and the emperor would exhibit the appearance of lenity, they contented themselves with plucking out the eye of a Christian, or cutting off one of his limbs. Great multitudes were mutilated in these and similar ways, and then sent to labor in the mines (Euseb. VIII. 11, 12). Never was such a regular and systematic attempt made, in Satanic madness, to utterly extinguish and exterminate the gospel.

The emperors already gave expression to their feeling of triumph in the inscriptions: "nomine Christianorum deleto, qui rempublicam evertebant," and "superstitione Christiana ubique deleta." But too soon. How could the church of the eternal God be annihilated! As it was, the edicts of the emperors had not been obeyed with exactitude in all parts of the empire. *Constantius Chlorus*, the ruler in the West, had caused but a few churches to be torn down, and he was more free to show favor towards the Christians when, in 305, the two Augusti, *Diocletian* and *Maximianus*, surrendered their office and dignity to the two Caesars, Constantius and Galerius. Even *Maxentius*, — who in 306 proclaimed himself ruler in Rome, and, in the end, became a tyrant who practised the most horrible acts of magic (Euseb. VIII. 14), — from policy, assumed a moderately favorable attitude towards the Christians. The shameless *Maximin*, indeed, — appointed Caesar in 305 by Galerius, — was as virulent an enemy of Christianity as Galerius himself, and under his instigation persecution of the most bloody and disgraceful character arose anew in the East (Euseb. VIII. 14). Fanaticism and despotism went so far, that in the year 308 it was ordered that all eatables exposed for sale at the markets should be sprinkled with sacrificial water or wine, and in the year 310 thirty-nine confessors were beheaded in Palestine. But this was the last blood spilt in this persecution. Its author *Galerius* was brought to reflection by a dreadful and loathsome disease (Euseb. VIII. 16). He perceived that it was not in human power to exterminate the Christians, and felt that his misery was the judgment-act of their God. In the year 311 he revoked, by an edict, the orders and regulations for persecution. His design, — he announced, — to bring back the Christians to the religion of their ancestors, had not succeeded. The purpose had been merely to prevent them from worshipping a particular God of their own: but now this would be permitted, provided only they did nothing contrary to the good order of the State; let them now pray to their God for the welfare of the empire and the emperor, as well as for their own [see Rev. iii. 9].[1]

---

[1] This edict is found in Greek, in Euseb., VIII. 17; and in Latin, in Lactantius De mortibus persecutorum, c. 34.

§ 28.

PAGAN WRITERS AGAINST CHRISTIANITY.

1. The gospel was opposed not merely by rude and brutal force; a series of *authors* also arrayed themselves against it, whose temper was all the more bitter in proportion as their wisdom appeared the higher in the eyes of the world.

Pagan writers, from the very beginning, agreed in passing unfavorable judgments respecting Christianity, but not all of them in particular works composed in opposition to it, — since for most of them a new religion was not an object of sufficient importance for this, — nor all of them in the same manner. *Stoics*, like *Marcus Aurelius*, saw in Christians only despicable fanatics (Comp. Arrian. Diatrib. IV. 7). *Scoffers* at all religion, like *Lucian* of Samosata (Comp. De morte Perigrini c. 11–16), as they jeered at everything sacred, so also at Christianity, and made themselves merry over the Christian's foolish notion of the immortality of the soul, his good-natured benevolence so ready to be imposed upon, and his silly brotherly-love. Earnest-minded and systematizing *New-Platonists*,[1] on the contrary, fixing themselves permanently upon that philosophical standing-point which others had made a mere stepping-stone to Christianity (comp. § 7), constructed a system of refined paganism in bitterest hostility to it.[2]

2. The first writer who attacked Christianity in a work composed for this special purpose was *Celsus* (about the

---

[1] The founders of the New-Platonic school were *Ammonius Saccas* in Alexandria († about 243), and the Egyptian *Plotinus* († 270).

[2] New-Platonism aimed to unite all philosophical schools in their deeper principle of unity, and all the mythologies of paganism in the fundamental religious idea lying under them. The gods were conceived of as subordinate to an original ground and source of being; as the personal powers or manifestations of the divine World-life, either placed over the world as its rulers, or connected with it as its servants. Soothsaying and magic were justified and employed, on the ground of the necessary connection of all phenomena, by virtue of the unifying power of the World-soul.

year 150). In this treatise, entitled *'Αληθὴς λόγος,* he appears as a philosophic eclectic and inconsequent Platonist; not without acuteness and sarcastic wit, but wholly destitute of thorough judgment and depth of apprehension, and too little in earnest to desire to penetrate, by a careful examination, into the internal connection of that which he had heard and learned, mostly from Jews, respecting the life and religion of Jesus. It is highly probable, according to the conjecture of Origen (Cont. Celsum), that this writer is one and the same with Celsus the Epicurean, a friend and contemporary of Lucian.[1]

A profounder opponent of Christianity was the highly esteemed New-Platonist *Porphyry* of Tyre (born 233, and died at Rome 304). He was the disciple of Plotinus, and composed a work in opposition to Christianity under the title of *Κατὰ Χριστιανῶν λόγοι,* of which only a few fragments are preserved in Eusebius (VI. 19). A man of Oriental spirit, to which he had given a Grecian shaping (according to a not sufficiently authentic statement of Socrates he was an apostate from Christianity), the Christian religion was odious to him as contrary to all ancestral religion. In this work "against Christianity" he endeavored, in particular, to detect a contradiction between Paul and Peter,[2] and to make use of the weak points in the allegorizing interpretations of the Old Testament. In another work, entitled *Περὶ τῆς ἐκ λογίων φιλοσοφίας*, — a system of theology made up from the ancient pretended oracular responses, by collecting them and accompanying them with his own interpretations, fragments of which have come down in Eusebius, Praepar. Ev. and Demonstr. Ev.,— Porphyry attempted to meet the generally felt need of some reliable system of religious knowledge. In this work he teaches his readers, among other things (Euseb. Dem. Ev. III. p. 134), that they must not speak disrespectfully of Jesus, but only commiserate the Christians who worship him as God.[1]

---

[1] As an Epicurean he perhaps made use of Platonic views, and adopted the New-Platonic eclecticism, merely in order to obtain an intellectual and moral foot-hold for his attack upon Christianity. The levity and shallowness with which Celsus, without going into any careful examination of the subject, makes the most self-contradictory charges against the Christians (of blind credulity and endless differences of opinion, of a propensity to the invisible and a cleaving to the sensuous, etc., etc.), agrees well with the character of an Epicurean, while at the same time he cannot conceal the fact to his own mind, that mere bald Epicureanism cannot make headway against Christianity, and hence conceals his sensual Epicurean spirit under the form of a spiritualizing eclectic New-Platonism. This is certainly the most probable hypothesis; for inasmuch as we know a Celsus who was the friend and contemporary of Lucian, and who wrote against magic, and to whom Lucian dedicated his work entitled *Pseudomantis*, and inasmuch as Origen himself regards this as the Celsus he is opposing, we are not able upon valid historical data to point out any other Celsus. Compare Fenger De Celso, Christianorum adversario, Epicureo; and Philippi De Celsi, adversarii Christianorum, philosophandi genere.

[2] Porphyry is thus the true founder of the Tübingen school.

The last direct literary opposer of Christianity in this period is *Hierocles*, governor of Bithynia, and afterwards of Alexandria under Diocletian, and a principal agent in the Diocletian persecution. In his work entitled *Λόγοι φιλαλήϑεις πρὸς Χριστιανούς* he repeats, as an "impartial friend of truth," or rather as out and out New-Platonist, much that had been said by Celsus and Pophyry, and allows himself to relate the most shameless falsehoods respecting the life of Christ. Among other things, he represents Christ as an insignificant dealer in magic, ana sets him below the famous heathen theosopher and wonder-worker, *Apollonius of Tyana*[2] (born B. C. 3, died A. D. 96), who professed to understand the language of animals.

---

[1] See Ullmann Einflusz des Christenthums auf Porphyrius, Studien und Kritiken 1832.

[2] The fabulous deifying account of the life of Apollonius, by the rhetorician *Philostratus* (230), in which he is represented as the ideal of a pious wise man wonderfully honored by the gods, has been regarded, and not without reason, as intended for an attack upon Christianity. Apollonius seems, in reality, to have been a seriously-inclined theosopher who felt himself called upon to oppose the unbelief and superstition of his time, but who as a heathen was not free himself from fanaticism, self-deception, and pantheism. The romancing and fanciful theory of *Baur* (Apollonius von Tyana und Christus), that Christianity is a copy of the Apollonian paganism, derives small support, to say the least, from a comparison of the relative positions which these two personages have occupied in the history of mankind.

JEWISH ANTI-CHRISTIAN WRITINGS.

From the *Jews* we have received no polemic works composed with special reference to the Christian religion; but they circumvallated the Old Testament, which might have conducted them to Christianity, with anti-Christian "commandments of men," by which their hearts were hardened against all knowledge of the Messiah, and the light of the gospel was entirely obscured. They also made a collection of the old traditions, partly ritual and legal, partly legendary and historical, in an enormous yet minutely scholastic work entitled the *Talmud;* i. e. doctrina, from לִמַּד. A revision of this body of traditional material, was made about 166 by *Jehuda*, surnamed the holy, and goes under the name of the *Mishna;* i. e. second law. The Palestine commentary upon the Mishna, the so-called *Jerusalem Gemara*, was not completed certainly before the last third of the 4th century, while the more voluminous revision of the Mishna entitled the *Babylonian Gemara*, which has taken the precedence of the Jerusalem revision, falls into the 6th century.

§ 29.

CHRISTIAN APOLOGISTS.[1]

Up to the time of Hadrian, the Christians opposed to the persecutions which they were called to pass through, only individual asseverations of their innocence, their blameless lives, and a silent endurance. From this point, onward, they defended their cause by written arguments and appeals; and the blooming period of Christian Apologetics falls within the age of the Antonines, when the church was moved equally by fear and by hope, and free expression was granted to every species of opinion. The Christian apologies of this entire period are of two sorts: official, and general. They were intended either to bring the cause of the persecuted, in an official form, before the Roman emperors, the Senate, or the Proconsular authorities, (for that this was merely an empty formality, like that employed by the pagan rhetoricians, as Bayle Semler and Henke conjecture, is without valid support); or else they contained a general statement of Christian truth for all cultivated pagans.

---

[1] Fabricius Delectus argumentorum et syllabus scriptorum, qui veritatem rel. Christ. asseruerunt. Tzschirner Der Fall des Heidenthums. Bolton Evidences of Christianity from the Early Fathers; Hulsean prize Essay for 1852

2. The earliest apologies of an official kind are now known only by name. *Quadratus*, — perhaps, according to Jerome, Catal. c. 19, identical with Quadratus bishop of Athens, — about the year 130 presented to the emperor Hadrian a written defence of Christianity which is not extant (Euseb. IV. 3; III. 37). According to Eusebius (IV. 3) he had seen those who had been healed by Jesus, and even those who had been raised from the dead by him. A manuscript copy of Quadratus was in existence in the 7th century (Photius Cod. 162). *Aristides*, an Athenian philosopher converted to Christianity (Euseb. IV. 3), composed an apology which was still preserved in the 17th century in a cloister at Athens. *Melito*, bishop of Sardis in Lydia, *Claudius Apollinaris*, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, and the converted rhetorician *Miltiades*, presented defences to Marcus Aurelius which have not come down to us (Euseb. IV. 26, 27; V. 17).

The first Christian apologist whose writings are extant is *Justin Martyr*, of the age of the Antonines. We have from him two apologies, characterized in the main by a beautiful Christian simplicity and heartiness, and constituting highly important memorials of an early Christian antiquity. The larger of them, it is commonly supposed, was addressed to Antoninus Pius, and the smaller to Marcus Aurelius; but perhaps both were addressed to Antoninus Pius. Justin's *Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo* is a defence of Christianity against the Jewish sceptic. To the class of Apologists belongs Justin's pupil *Tatian* of Assyria, who died (a Gnostic) about 174, from whom we have a work entitled *Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας,* in which he defends the philosophy of the barbarians generally, against the contempt of the Greeks. *Theophilus*, bishop of Antioch († about 181), succeeds in the series, who maintains and unfolds the Christian doctrine in a work addressed to a pagan named Autolycus. Then follows *Athenagoras*, who addressed his *Πρεσβεία* (intercessio) *περὶ Χριστιανῶν* to Marcus Aurelius, — a work marked by transparent clearness. At the end of the second and beginning of the third century, *Clement of Alexandria* composed a learned and able apologetic work, general in its character, under the title *Λόγος προτρεπτικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας*; and *Tertullian*, his contemporary at Carthage, addressed an official apology, entitled *Apologeticus*, and characterized by fiery energy, to the Roman proconsul and the resident governors in Africa. This same work he recast, under the title of *Ad Nationes*, and addressed it to the pagans generally of all ranks. It has come down in a very imperfect form. *Minucius Felix*, a distinguished advocate at Rome, converted to Christianity about 220, defended the Christian doctrine in a dialogue entitled *Octavius*, particularly effective in respect to form and style. To him succeeds *Origen*, whose apologetical work, *Contra Celsum libb. VIII.*, is the most important one of this period, and one of the foremost productions in ancient Christian literature. Lastly, *Arnobius*, a rhetorician of Sicca in Numidia, at the end of the third and beginning of the fourth century, previously an opposer of Christianity, as the proof of his sincerity required by the bishop before his baptism, composed his *Disputationes Adversus Gentes*; — a learned work, but not entirely pure in doctrine.

While *Tertullian* sought, in the employment of a profound psychology, to recommend the Christian monotheism, by an appeal to the spontaneous expressions of the universal religious consciousness (Apol. c. 17,[1] and more fully in the tract De testimonio animae), it was a frequent endeavor of other Christian apologists to prove to the pagans that their own best authors, — philosophers, poets, etc., — in pointing towards monotheism, and opposing the cruder forms of polytheism, without however discovering a system of religion satisfactory to themselves, had prepared the way for Christianity. For this purpose they made rich selections from pagan literature, and drew deductions from them; of which the *Stromata* of *Clemens Alexandrinus* may be taken as a specimen. In some instances they made use of writings which bore an ancient name indeed, but which were spurious. Of these there were three classes: —

---

[1] Anima licet carcere corporis pressa, licet institutionibus pravis circumscripta, licet libidinibus ac concupiscentiis evigorata, licet falsis diis exancillata, cum tamen resipiscit ut ex crapula, ut ex somno . . , *deum* nominat, hoc solo nomine quia proprio dei veri, *deus magnus, deus bonus* . . . O testimonium animae naturaliter Christianae! Denique pronuntians haec, non ad Capitolium, sed ad coelum respicit. Novit enim sedem dei vivi; ab illo et inde descendit.

1. The *Sibylline Books;* i. e. predictions which were attributed to different pagan Sibyls, but which, for the most part, were not of pagan origin, though so regarded by the Christian apologist, — partly from a defective criticism, and partly from a joyful surprise at finding such striking coincidences with the teachings of revelation.[1]

2. The writings that were circulating under the name of *Hermes Trismegistus;* a mythical personage whose teachings had great authority in Egypt.

3. Predictions bearing the name of *Hystaspes* or *Gustasp;* an ancient king or sage of Persia.

---

[1] Birger-Thorlacius Libri Sibyllistarum crisi subjecti; and Conspectus doctr. Christ. qualis in Sibyllistarum libris continetur. Bleek Untersuchung über die Entstehung der sibyll. Orakel.

SECTION SECOND.

Church Polity.

Neander Church History, I. 179–217. Rothe Die Anfänge der Christl Kirche. Baur Ursprung des Episcopats. Mosheim Commentaries, Century I. Sect. 37–48. Bingham Antiquities of the Christian Church. Hooker Ecclesiastical Polity. Ritschl Die Entstehung der altkath. Kirche. Coleman Primitive Church. Ziegler Pragm. Gesch. der Kirchl. Gesellschaftsformen in den ersten 6 Jahrhunderten. Campbell Lectures on Ecclesiastical History.

§ 30.

CONSTITUTION OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

1. Constitution of the Churches in the Apostolic Age. Through Christ, the reconciliation of God with man had been effected, once and for all men, and thus all which had been prefigured, and prepared for, by the entire ante-Christian priesthood was now realized in the fullest manner. Hence the idea of the common priesthood of all Christians was the necessary accompaniment of the gospel. All believers in Christ become by baptism and the Holy Ghost a spiritual house and a holy priesthood (1 Pet. ii. 5, 9; Rev. i. 6), and all of them are immediately united with Christ, the eternal high priest and only head of his church. Hence, in the Christian system, the priestly office is not limited, as in other religions, to a single hereditary class, or to a close and self-electing corporation. Christianity has no sacerdotal caste of persons, from whom alone the incumbents of its sacred offices must be chosen. It was owing to this universal priestly character of all Christians, that some of those functions

which were afterwards called "clerical" were not discharged by a clerical class in the Apostolic age, so marked by its large and loving mental freedom. Each and every believer, for example, if so inclined, was at liberty, according to his gifts and graces, to co-operate in word or deed for the common edification (Com. 1 Cor. xii. 27 seq. with 1 Cor. xiv. 26). The female sex was the only portion of the association expressly forbidden to engage in public instruction (1 Cor. xiv. 34; 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12), — on the ground of a natural impropriety.

But as the possession of a kingly character did not constitute all Christians *official* kings, so neither did the possession of a priestly character constitute them *official* priests. Hence there was from the beginning, in accordance with divine establishment (Matt. x. 16; xxviii. 19; John xx. 21), after the election and mission of the apostles, an *office* of the New Testament (2 Cor. iii. 6 seq.; iv. 1; vi. 3): an office of steward of the mystery of God (1 Cor. iv. 1; Tit. i. 7); an office of pastor and teacher, etc., (Eph. iv. 11); an office of *preacher* (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15). And how can the *visible* body of the Christian church exist in an orderly manner, unless, in all the churches gathered and to be gathered by the Spirit of God and the preaching of the gospel, particular persons are called, by divine and human ordinances, to the preaching of the word, to the pastoral care of the flock of God, and to the guidance and administration of the concerns of the sacred association?

In accordance with the command of Christ, the *Apostles* had the oversight of the entire body of churches, — sometimes acting through special deputies, like *Timothy* and others, in the organization of single churches. In the single church, by apostolical ordinance and partly in accordance with the Jewish pattern of polity,[1] *Elders*, *Πρεσβύτεροι* or *Ἐπίσκοποι*, constituted the presiding officers. That both names originally denoted the same office, — as is conceded even in the fourth century by Jerome (Comm. in Tit. i. 7;[2] Ep. 82 Ad.

---

[1] The זְקֵנִים. Comp. Vitringa De Synagoga vetere, Lib. III. P. I. c. 1–3.

[2] "Idem est ergo presbyter, qui episcopus, et antequam diaboli instinctu studia

Oceanum, Ep. 84 Ad. Evagr., and Ep. 146 Ad Evangelum);[1] by Ambrosiaster or Hilary of Rome (Comm. in 1 Tim. iii. and Eph. iv. 11);[2] also to some extent by the Constitutiones Apostolicae (Lib. III. c. 11);[3] for substance, by Chrysostom also (Hom. I. in Philipp. i. 1), and Theodoret (upon Phil. i. 1. and 1 Tim. iii.), — is plain from the New Testament passages in which the names are used interchangeably (Acts xx. 17, 28; Tit. i. 5, 7); and in which bishops and deacons, without the mention of presbyters intermediate, are mentioned as the only ecclesiastical officers in the single churches (Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 8; Comp. Clem. Rom. Ep. I. Ad. Cor. c. 42, 44). The original identity of elders and bishops is also proved by those passages in the New Testament in which, the office of bishop being passed over, that of elder is spoken of as next to that of the apostles (Acts xv. 6, 22 seq.); in which the term elder denotes the one only office of ruling and pastoral care (1 Tim. v. 17; 1 Pet. v. 2); and in which the apostles denominate themselves co-elders (1 Pet. v. 1; Comp. 2 John 1; 3 John 1). The *official duty* of the presbyter or bishop (or *ποιμένες, ἡγούμενοι, προεστῶτες τῶν ἀδελφῶν*) was, in general, according to Acts xx. 28, 1 Pet. v. 2, "to feed the flock of God." This included, first, the ministration of the word of truth (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15; Acts vi. 4; 2 Cor. iii. 9; v. 18; Tit. 1. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 2); secondly, the ministration of the sacraments (1 Cor. iv. 1, compared with Matt. xxviii. 19; Luke xxii. 19); thirdly, the maintenance of discipline (John xx. 23; Matt. xviii. 18), — not as "lords" over the members of the church, but as "ensamples" to the flock and "helpers of their joy" (1 Pet. v. 3; 2 Cor. i. 24). The discharge of these functions involved the general administration of the affairs of the church; particularly the guidance of the assem-

---

in religione fierent, . . . communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesiae gubernabantur . . Episcopi noverint, se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis dominicae veritate presbyteris esse majores, et in commune debere ecclesiam regere."

[1] "Apostolus perspicue docet, eosdem esse presbyteros, quos episcopos."

[2] "Primi presbyteri episcopi appellabantur."

[3] Augusti Archaeologie Th. VII.

blies for public worship and instruction, the supervision and preservation of discipline in the body, and the adjustment of strifes and difficulties among the members, etc. (Compare Tertullian Apol. c. 39). The specific office of *teacher* naturally and necessarily constituted an integral part, — and indeed a principal part, — of this generic office of pastor or "feeder" of the flock. From the very first, the official character of the apostles themselves, in accordance with the appointment of Christ (Matt. xxviii. 19), had concentrated itself chiefly in that of the preacher. In Acts vi. 4. the office of elder, borne by the apostles, is distinguished from that of the newly established deacon's office, by being fixed and designated as an office of *the word*; and, in 1 Tim. iii. 2, and Tit. i. 9, a capability of teaching officially is expressly required of presbyters or bishops,[1] — although in the time of the apostles, certainly, there were some "πρεσβύτεροι" who did not "labor in word and doctrine" (1 Tim. v. 17).[2] In the time of the apostles, there were also some presbyters who had no connection with a particular church, but who employed their gift of teaching in planting new churches among the heathen. These missionary presbyters were denominated *Evangelists* (Eph. iv. 11).

The second ecclesiastical office in the single church was that of *Deacon*, *Διάκονοι* (Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12), of whom originally there were seven. This office was at first established for the collection and distribution of alms, and for the care of the poor and the sick (Acts vi. 1 seq.);[3] yet there were, very early, individual deacons, as *Stephen* and particularly *Philip*, who labored in word (Acts vi–viii), and baptized (Acts viii. 12 seq.), while all, according to the apostolic ordinance (Acts vi. 3) were to be "full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom." In these instances, however, the function of teaching was discharged *additionally* to those of the deaconship; for Stephen was endowed with extra-ordinary gifts (Acts vi. 8 seq.), and Philip administered the office not only of a deacon, but also of an evangelist (Acts viii. 5 seq.). For the service and care of the female portion of the church, the office of *Deaconess*, *Διακονίσσαι Αἱ Διάκονοι*, existed at least in the first centuries (Rom xvi. 1, compared with Pliny, Ep. Ad. Traj. x. 96).[1]

---

[1] That in these passages an *official* fitness to give public instruction is meant, and not that unofficial ability in this respect which the Scriptures require of every Christian (Col. iii. 16), is evident from the fact that when the qualifications for the deacon's office, as distinguished from the presbyter's, are specified (1 Tim. iii. 8 seq.) this "aptness" at teaching is not required.

[2] Unless perhaps in 1 Tim v. and possibly in Acts xv. 6, 22 seq., the term "elders" is used in a loose and general sense to embrace all the officers of the church, deacons included. In the N. T., whenever the eldership is sought to be specifically distinguished from the deaconship, the term *πρεσβύτερος* is not employed to denote the former, but the term *επίσκοπος;* compare Philip i. 1. and 1 Tim. iii. 8. It is well known that, at a later day, the deaconesses bore the name *πρεσβύτιδες*.

[3] The circle of duties was in process of time gradually enlarged; so much so, that the identity of the later deacons with the first seven of Acts vi. has been dis-

In regard to the *choice* of church officers, — the first deacons were chosen by the church at the proposal of the apostles (Acts vi.); and this was also the mode, certainly at times, of making choice of the missionary preachers, or evangelists. The first presbyters were appointed by the apostles or their deputies (Tit. i. 5, compare Acts xiv. 23). In the age succeeding (according to Clem. Rom. 1 Cor. c. 44), they were chosen "by other tried and capable men,"[2] — without doubt elders or bishops,[3] — yet with the aid and concur-

---

puted. The correctness, however, of the theory that the later deaconship, with its confessedly wider sphere of labor, is only the expansion of the apostolic deaconship, is proved by many passages in the fathers; (Comp. Orig. in Matt. T. 16; Cyprian Ep. 49, 55; Dionys. Alex. in Euseb. VII. 11; Jerome Ep. 146; also Constitutt. Apost. III. 19).

[1] The ordination of deaconesses began to be disapproved of, in the Western Church, as early as the middle of the fourth century (Ambrosiaster in 1 Tim. iii. 11, compared with Concil. Laodic. c. 11), and was expressly forbidden by the Council of Orange in 441 (can. 26); while in the East it continued to be practised far into the Middle Ages (coupled with the right to baptize and preach privately, according to Pelag. in Rom. xvi. 1). At the same time the early church, in opposition to the wild enthusiasm of heretical sects, rigidly enforced the apostolic rule, which unconditionally excludes the female sex from public official instruction (1 Cor. xiv. 31; Tertull. De praescr. c. 41, De virgg. vel. c. 9, Adv. Marc. V. 8). The office of deaconess, however, was not regarded as an office of teaching, but of service, and was for this reason given to the female sex (Constitutt. Apost. III. 15, II. 26; Epiphan. Expos. Fid. c. 21).

[2] The words of Clement are ὑφ᾽ ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν.

[3] The whole passage in Clement is as follows: Καὶ οἱ απόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν

rence of the whole church. Presbyters and deacons were *consecrated* to their office by prayer and laying on of hands (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6; Acts vi. 6; 1 Tim. v. 22); sometimes the hands of the apostles (Acts vi. 6; 2 Tim. i. 6), or of their deputies (1 Tim. v. 22), or of presbyters (Acts xiii. 3, here called "teachers," 1 Tim. iv. 14).

2. CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH AFTER THE APOSTOLIC AGE. The polity of the church, after the death of the apostles and their pupils, underwent a change in a three-fold respect.

a. *The relation of the bishop to the presbyter* was altered by the formation of an Episcopate, or an established superiority of the bishop over the presbyter. In the apostolic age there were certainly presbyters and bishops, but these latter were not bishops in the later meaning of the term. They were bishops *or* presbyters, and their official relations were limited to the individual church. The general oversight of churches, — a function afterwards assigned to the diocesan and hierarchical bishops and finally to the primate, — was exercised by the apostles; and, of these, the apostle James, perhaps, sustained a relationship to the mother church at Jerusalem that would afford the nearest parallel, in this age, to that sustained by the later bishop distinctively so called. It is certain, consequently, that the *Episcopate* properly so called,

διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν 'I. Χρ., ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. Διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν, κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους, (i. e. bishops and deacons, c. 42) καὶ μεταξὺ τὴν ἐπινομὴν δεδώκασιν, ὅπως ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. Τοὺς οὖν κατασταθέντας ὑπ' ἐκείνων, ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν. συνευδοκησάσης τῆς εκκλησίας πάσης, καὶ λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . . . τούτους οὐ δικαίως νομίζομεν ἀποβαλέσθαι τῆς λειτουργίας κ. τ. λ. . From the meaning and connection of this passage, — which is the locus classicus, in settling the question respecting the choice of presbyters and bishops in the time immediately succeeding that of the apostles, — it is plain that no view is tenable which assumes the choice of bishops and presbyters to have been made by others than the bishops and presbyters then holding office, together with the brotherhood; for the ἕτεροι ἐλλόγιμοι ἄνδρες are no others than the successors of the first series of elders or bishops appointed by the apostles. Those who assert the apostolical establishment of the Episcopate contend that ἀυτῶν (τὴν λειτουργίαν ἀυτῶν) refers to the apostles themselves, and not to τοὺς προειρημένους (i. e. bishops and deacons mentioned in c. 42); but in this case the writer would have used ἑαυτῶν.

—i. e. the established superiority of the bishop over the presbyter,—as an institution of the entire Christian church, came into existence after the apostolic age. The question arises: how did this happen? It came in gradually and imperceptibly, inasmuch as there was no apostolic command expressly forbidding it, and inasmuch as the position of the college of apostles, and particularly that of James at Jerusalem, furnished an analogon to the later episcopal office. The oversight of the apostles having ceased by their death, it was natural, particularly under a political system that favored the centralization of power, and in the midst of heretical tendencies which rendered consolidation and visible unity desirable, that that particular one of the college of elders who had held the office longest, and had been most often appointed to preside, should gradually acquire a higher authority than his co-presbyters, and come to be distinguished as *Bishop* over them. He was however in the theory of polity, still only primus inter pares, and the words ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος were still used as synonymes (Polycarp Ep. c. 5; Irenaeus Adv. Haer. III. 2, 3; IV. 26, 43, 44; V. 20; Euseb. V. 24). Late in the 3d century,—a century that was especially favorable to the growth of the episcopal power, and the formation of an hierarchical episcopate,—a college of presbyters, as a collegium *com*-presbyterorum (Cyprian Epist. 5, and Ep. 12 Ad Cler. de lapsis), was associated with the bishop as a counselling body;[1] and Ambrosiaster, who particularly recommends the episcopate as a "remedium in schismatis" in his commentary upon 1 Tim. iii. and Eph. iv. 11, denominates the bishop inter presbyteros primum, primum presbyterum. And although the bishops now had the supervision of the principal affairs of the church, and the consecration of a bishop began to be distinguished from that of a presbyter, yet down to the end of the 4th century the only definite and actual *prerogatives* of the bishops, besides their exclusive right of vote at synods, were the ordination of the clergy (Comp.

---

[1] The Synod of Carthage, A. D. 398. Can. 23 (Mansi III. 953) decreed: Episcopus nullus causam audiat absque praesentia clericorum suorum. Alioquin irrita erit sententia episcopi, nisi clericorum sententia confirmetur.

Chrysost. Homil. in 1 Tim. iii. 8; Jerome Ep. 85), and confirmation (Jerome Dial. adv. Luciferianos).[1]

b. *The relation of the clergy (officers) to the churches* was changed, in that the sacred office was more and more withdrawn from the influence and power of the church, and became more and more a clerical prerogative. Ever since the election and mission of the apostles, there had been a special office of the word, in the church, along with the universal priesthood of all believers; not in antithesis to this latter but rather as its innermost circle. But in proportion as the spirit of liberty, which in the early church was regulated by the spirit of love and humility, passed over into a spirit of licentiousness and showed an inclination to overstep the bounds of order, so much the more firmly did the church in the second and third centuries grasp the Old Testament idea of the priesthood (Comp. Tertull. De bapt. c. 17. and particularly Cyprian Ep. 66). As a consequence, the natural distinction between the teacher and the taught, the guide and the guided, assumed more and more a hierarchical form and coloring. This more and more defined and systematic conception of a Christian priesthood analogous to the Jewish, in connection with the enlargement of the churches themselves, and a greater variety in their membership, gradually introduced a sharper separation of the officers from the membership; and this too, not merely in respect to official position, as had previously been the case, but in respect to person and character, so that the latter no longer, as before, had an equal share in the management of the general affairs of the church. The name *κλῆρος* or *κληρικός*, when first employed to distinguish the clergy from the church or *λάος*, appears to have had only the meaning of *κληρούμενοι*, i. e. those called by God's providential appointment to preside over the concerns of the church;[1] but in the 3d century, inasmuch as the clergy no longer, as many of them had previously done, supported themselves by the labor of their own hands, but were maintained out of a common treasury filled by the weekly or monthly contributions, the Levitical interpretation was put upon the word,—*ὧν ὁ κλῆρος ἐστιν ὁ ϑεός*,—and the clergy were *οἵ εἰσιν ὁ κλῆρος τοῦ ϑεοῦ*.[2] Still, the laity, even now, had by no means lost all share in the management of the concerns of the church. Without the coöperation of the membership, as well as of the other clergy, the bishops were not accustomed to proceed to the election of a clergyman (Cypr. Ep. 33), and the individual church was at liberty to prefer objections to the clergyman elect (Ael. Lamprid. vita Alex. Sev.). Vacant bishoprics, in the 3d century, were filled by the bishops of the province only with the concurrence of the church; and in exceptional cases the church itself, without waiting for the bishops, chose a successor to the deceased bishop. The laity still took part in the exclusion of members from church privileges, and in their reception again (comp. § 33). Lastly, there were many non-clerical individuals who exerted special influence upon the affairs of the church; of these were the Confessores, i. e. those who had remained constant in their confession of Christ under severe persecution, and the Seniores plebis, a species of middle-men between the clergy and laity, found in the North African churches in the 4th century, who were expressly distinguished from the clergy proper, and yet had some ecclesiastical oversight in the church (Comp. Ambrosiaster Comm. in 1 Tim. v., and Optat. Milev. De schismate Donat. ed. Du Pin. p. 169).

---

[1] The germ of the Episcopate is distinctly visible in the Epistles of Ignatius, and the writings of this apostolic father are the principal source of the argument for the early origin of episcopacy. A comparison, however, of the views of Ignatius with those of the other apostolic fathers, plainly evinces that there was a difference of opinion between himself and them respecting polity. This writer exhibits the high church tendency of a locality (Asia Minor), and not the theory of polity universally established and prevalent at the time. For he is evidently endeavoring to bring others (Polycarp e. g.) up to his own position, — a proof that episcopacy, at the beginning of the second century, was more the polity of a party than of Christendom. The anxiety and urgency of Ignatius, in the respect spoken of, may be seen in Ad Ephesios 4–6; Ad Magnesios 2–7, 13; Ad Trallianos 1–7, 12, 13; etc. — *Translator.*

---

[1] Compare Acts i. 17, 25; 1 Pet. v. 3; Irenaeus Adv. Haer. i. 28; III. 3; Clem. Alex. Quis. div. c. 42; Euseb. V. 1, 28; August. in Ps. lxvii. 19; Chrysost. Hom. 3 in Act. App.

[2] According to Jerome, Ep. 52 (al. 34) ad Nepotianum § 5, "Clerici vocantur quia de sorte sunt Domini, vel quia ipse Dominus sors i. e. pars clericorum est,"—with reference to Numbers xviii. 20, 21; Deut. x. 9; xviii. 1, 2.

c. *The number of the grades of the clergy and of ecclesiastical officers* was multiplied. By the middle of the 3rd century (See a letter of the Romish bishop Cornelius in Euseb. VI. 43), the following new ecclesiastical officers had appeared, who were afterwards denominated *Ordines minores*, to distinguish them from the *Ordines majores* (bishop, presbyter and deacon): 1. The *Ὑποδιάκονοι*, Subdiaconi (Cypr. Ep. 23), who assisted the deacons in the discharge of their functions;[1] 2. The *Ἀκόλουθοι*, Acoluthi or Acolythi (only in the West), assistants to the bishop in the performance of some episcopal functions (Cypr. Ep. 78, 79); 3. The Exorcistae (also only in the West), who had the care of the possessed, *ἐνεργούμενοι*, when commended to the prayers of the church, and prayed over them (Cypr. Ep. 75, 76), — a work which at an earlier day was regarded as the free gift of the Spirit alone[2] — and who afterwards had the same duty of offering prayers in behalf of the catechumens of the church; 4. The *Αναγνῶσται*, Lectores, who read the Scriptures (the longer passages) in public, and took care of the manuscripts of the Bible. — probably the most ancient of all these officers of the second order;[3] 5. The *Πυλωροί*, Ostiarii, who had charge of all the external arrangements of the church.[4]

---

[1] According to the Constitutt. Apost. VIII. 21, the subdeacon alone of the *Ordines minores* was ordained with the laying on of hands.

[2] As the Constitt. Apost. VIII. 26 indicate.

[3] They are spoken of by Tertullian De praescrr. c. 42, and Cyprian Ep. 33.

[4] According to Cornelius bishop of Rome, the *personnel* of that church in his day consisted of forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, seven subdeacons, forty two acolyths, and fifty-two exorcists, lectors, and ostiarii.

§ 31

RELATION OF THE CHURCHES TO EACH OTHER.

1. The mutual relations of the individual churches were very naturally conditioned by the political relations of their localities,—as indeed the preaching and labors of the apostles themselves had been,—according as these were villages, or cities, or metropolises, or the Roman metropolis itself.

As a general rule, Christianity spread from the cities into the country. Christians from the country, at first, came into the city for public worship (Justin Martyr Apol. I. p. 83); upon the increase of their numbers, they applied to the bishop of the city for a presbyter to be placed over them;[1] but the city bishop still retained the right of supervision over the country church, and in this way arose the first form of a more extended ecclesiastical connection,—that viz. between the city and country churches. Only seldom, at first, were individual churches formed in the country villages having their own independent bishops, *Χωρεπίσκοποι,* whom we find mentioned first in the 3rd, and more particularly in the 4th, century. In many of the larger cities, as Rome, Carthage, Alexandria, the city-church itself was forced to be divided, as one church was no longer sufficient, and several city-churches were thus established subordinate to the old one presided over by the bishop. Over these, as distinct filial churches, presbyters were appointed by the bishop; or, in case the mother church was not subdivided into distinct communities, different presbyters conducted public worship in rotation, on days and occasions when one edifice was not sufficient to contain the assemblage.

A more important ecclesiastical connection sprang out of the relations which the Capital of a province sustained to the other cities within it. As a general rule the gospel had been preached first in the metropolis, and from this had extended to the other provincial cities. On account of the natural superiority of the capital over the other cities and towns, the church in the capital soon came to be regarded as the principal church for the province, and its bishop as Episcopus primae sedis, or metropolitan of all the churches in the province. During the first period, however, this was the case almost solely in the Eastern church. A still higher influence than that of the provincial capitals, was exerted by those cities which were the centres of the great divisions of the empire, and in which the apostles themselves, or their immediate pupils and friends, had preached the gospel, and from which it had radiated widely. Such were Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, Ephesus, Corinth; and the churches of these cities, as Ecclesiae (or Sedes) Apostolicae, acquired an altogether special authority. Particularly distinguished above the other Sedes Apostolicae, was the church of the metropolis of the world, the richest in wealth and benefactions, and made illustrious by the martyrdom of the two great apostles (Iren. Adv. Haer. III. 3, 2).

---

[1] Such country-presbyters are spoken of in the Acta proconsularia Cyprian. c 1, and in Euseb. VII. 24.

2. The connection of the churches with each other was particularly strengthened by the institution of the *Synod.* Very early the Christian communities, under the impulse of fraternal feeling and the pressure of sufferings and persecutions, must have felt the need of conferring together respecting their common interests, after the pattern of the convention of apostles and elders at Jerusalem (§ 15). Yet such convocations or synods are not distinctly mentioned until after the year 150, when they were held for the settlement of the disputes respecting the time of Easter, and the suppression of Montanism (Euseb. V. 16). A definite account of a *regular system* of provincial synods, and particularly of the deliberations of ecclesiastical deputies in *Greece*, we do not find until after the year 200, in Tertullian De jejuniis c. 13. These provincial synods, which sprang up in close connection with the metropolitan polity, seem to have been general down to the year 250 (Cypr. Ep. 40, 75). The me-

tropolitan annually, after Easter,[1] assembled the bishops of his province in a convocation over which he presided.[2]

3. The churches very early, even those of the most remote provinces, were brought into connection with each other by *Letters-missive*,[3] and by itinerating Christians. These latter found everywhere, among their fellow-believers, temporal and spiritual aid. But in order that impostors and false teachers should not avail themselves of this aid, every travelling Christian was required to bring a testimonial, signed by the bishop in the name of the church from which he came (epistolae formatae, *γράμματα τετυπωμένα*,—epistolae communicatoriae, *γράμματα κοινωνικά*), which secured for him, everywhere, a fraternal reception.

§ 32.

THE *ONE* CATHOLIC CHURCH, AND ITS REPRESENTATIVE.

The Christian church, one in its essential nature, since Christ and the Holy Spirit are one in essence, is also ideally one in its form and manifestation. This idea of unity in the manifestation, or of visible unity in the church, was cherished all the more by the first Christians, as forming a striking contrast to the fragmentary nature of the heathenism from which they had been gathered out. In proportion as the little companies of believers, scattered throughout the whole Roman Empire, felt themselves to be cast out by the world, the more vividly did they realize the connection of the church on earth with the eternal kingdom of God in heaven, and the less were they inclined to divide the "body of Christ," either in respect to its inward nature or its external form. Tracing back the origin of the church to the unity and harmony of apostolic doctrine and labor, they regarded all who diverged from it, either by teaching new and different doctrine, or by forming new and self-isolating associations, as heretics and schismatics,[1] who were both, alike, opposing the inherent and apostolically intended unity of the church. The doctrine of the one "Catholic"[2] church (ἐκκλησία καϑολική), in opposition to separatists and disorganizers, very early constituted a more or less distinct integral in the general confession of faith.[3]

---

[1] Canon Apostol. 30.

[2] The first synod (Acts xv. 6) was composed only of the apostles and presbyters. Afterwards the laity, though without active participation, were not excluded from the synods (Sententiae episcc. 87 de haeret. baptiz. in Cyprian's works). In course of time, however, the synod was confined to the clergy, though not to the bishops (Sent. episcc. supra, and Euseb. VI. 43), who however soon came to have the sole right to vote in them.

[3] For example, in the 2nd century, those of the Gallic churches to Asia Minor (Euseb. V. 1); those of the church at Smyrna to Pontus (Euseb. IV. 15) etc. The New Testament Epistles were in this way, chiefly, made generally known to the church.

There was certainly danger lest the church should overestimate the visible unity, and hold the doctrine of one definite external constitution, at the expense of the unity of spirit in faith and in love. The position of Cyprian, laid down in his work *De unitate ecclesiae*, that only he who was outwardly (but perhaps not *merely* outwardly) a member of that church which had been continued from the time of the apostles downward, and verified by an unbroken series of bishops as their successors, was really in connection with the kingdom of God, and that outside of this visible (but perhaps not *merely* visible) unity of the Catholic church there was no salvation, — this position, especially after the experience of later centuries, cannot but appear one-sided and crude. But the thing itself which the ancient church aimed at, provided it be not confounded with the subsequent formalism and mechanical logic of the Papal theory, and be asserted of the comparatively pure and spiritual church of the first ages, and of churches like it, was in substance neither unapostolic nor false; and had the ancient church insisted upon it with less earnestness and decision than it did, it would have become the prey of heresies and schisms, and with difficulty have come forth victorious in the conflict with heathenism.

---

[1] Comp. Irenaeus Adv. Haer. IV. 26.

[2] The word is used substantially in this sense by Ignatius Ad. Smyrn. c. 8; and by the church at Smyrna in the letter respecting Polycarp's death (Euseb. IV. 15).

[3] The Nicene Symbol confesses in full the "Unam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam." Of preceding symbols, some recensions of the Apostle's Creed, some copies of the Symbolum Aquileience, and the Symbolum Orientale, confess the (unam) sanctam catholicam ecclesiam, while other copies of the Symbolum Aquil. together with the old Symbolum Romanum omit the "catholicam."

To this idea of the necessary visible unity of the church, was joined, in the age of Cyprian, another one which by no means, however, flows from it,—the idea, viz., of a *representative* of this church unity in the apostle Peter. The episcopate had already (§ 30, 2) furnished a centre for an external ecclesiastical unity.[1] But the theorist sought for a more indivisible centre than this, and found it in the individual apostle Peter; without, however, at this time attributing to him any higher dignity, essentially, than to the other apostles. The warrant for this was supposed to be found in Matthew xvi. 18, 19. In this manner, a great and corrupting error came into the theory of ecclesiastical polity. Moreover, even conceding the correctness of this interpretation of the words of Christ, and granting that Peter is here appointed the representative of the visible unity of the church, it by no means followed that the *Romish* bishop, rather than any other one, was his successor. The Roman bishops would be full as much the successors of Paul as of Peter; to say nothing of the fact that neither Paul nor Peter were bishops of Rome (§ 14, 15). Yet Cyprian regarded the Roman bishops as the successors of Peter, and the Roman church as the Cathedra Petri, and transferred the idea of the representation of the unity of the church by Peter to them (Ep. 55 ad Cornel.).[2] But when the Roman bishops deduced from this error the notion of the superiority of this church over all others, and when in the last half of the 3d century the bishop *Stephanus* sought, in opposition to Cyprian, to make valid his claim to the right of giving an authoritative and final ecclesiastical decision (Cypr. Ep. 74), Cyprian was the farthest possible from acknowledging this supreme judicial authority. On the contrary, in connection with *Firmilian* bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, he attributed (Cypr. Ep. 75) equal authority to the traditions of other Sedes Apostolicae than the Roman, distinctly asserted the independence of all bishops of each other, since as successors of the Apostles they possessed equal episcopal rights, and opened a North-African council (256) with bold and strong language in opposition to the pretensions of Rome.

---

[1] Episcopatus unus, episcoporum multorum concordi numerositate diffusus. Cyprian. Ep. 62.

[2] Cyprian here denominates the Roman church "Petri Cathedra, ecclesia principalis, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est." A sentiment not less strong than this is found in Irenaeus Adv. Haer. III. 3, 2: "Ad hanc enim ecclesiam, propter potiorem principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam."

§ 33.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

The church, holy and pure in its origin and ideal nature, has, yet, to struggle for the realization of its own ideal of purity and perfection; and if, owing to the infirmity and ignorance of human nature, unworthy and lifeless members cannot be entirely excluded from the pale of the visible church, and the final sifting must be reserved for the day of judgment, so that the visible church upon earth is like the wheat-field in which both wheat and tares are growing together, still only wheat is to be expected from the wheat-field, and the tares must be rooted up to the fullest extent possible without injury to the grain. Hence, in the early church, in conformity with apostolic ordinance (Compare 1 Cor. v. 5; 1 Tim. i. 19, 20; Gal. i. 8, 9; 1 John ii. 19; 2 John 10; Rev. ii. 2, 14; Acts v.), whoever had violated his baptismal vow by overt sin, whoever had shown himself plainly unworthy of the Christian name in doctrine[1] or conduct, by unchristian word or work, was excluded from church communion (excommunicatio), in the exercise of the power of the keys given by Christ to the church, in order to assert the sacred character of even the visible church, to preserve its members from the influence of evil examples, to stop the mouths of slanderers, and to awaken the delinquent to a new and more earnest repentance. In case the excommunicated, as *Poenitentes* put upon probation for re-admission into the church, manifested a true and tried repentance, they were, in accordance with apostolical ordinance (2 Cor. ii. 5 seq.), restored to communion again. The length of this probation was proportioned to the offence, being sometimes years in duration (Cypr. Ep. 12). After the penitent had given in a confession of his sin, the absolution (absolutio, reconciliatio, pax) of the church was imparted by the laying on of hands by the bishop and the clergy, with the concurrence of the whole church. Though restored to church communion, the penitent was forever incapacitated to hold a clerical office. Only a small party in the church held that absolution should not be granted in certain specified cases of gross transgression (deadly sins).

---

[1] Not in conduct merely. Even the free-thinking Origen declares (Commentarior. series in Matt. 33) "malum quidem est, invenire aliquem secundum mores vitae errantem; multo autem pejus arbitror esse, in dogmatibus aberrare."

Definite prescripts respecting the proper mode of procedure in excommunication, penance, and absolution, the result of a common deliberation of the bishops, seem to have been first occasioned by the Decian persecution (Cypr. Epp. e. g. 16—18). By the end of the 3d century, the mode of re-admission into the church had assumed the form which it continued to retain for a long time afterwards. So far as the externals of penance (poenitentia) were concerned, there were four grades (gradus or stationes), which every penitent was obliged to pass through, continuing in each stage one or even more years according to the nature of his fault: viz. *πρόσκλαυσις, ἀκρόασις, ὑπόπτωσις* and *σύστασις*. The Poenitentes were denominated *προσκλαίοντες*, flentes, *χειμάζοντες*, hiemantes, when, before the church door clothed in mourning garments, they implored of the clergy and the church a re-admission; they were called *ἀκροώμενοι*, audientes, when they were permitted to enter within the doors, and take their station in the narthex, or lower part of the church, and listen to the reading and exposition of the scriptures, but were denied the privilege of joining in the prayers and worship of the church; they were termed *ὑποπίπτοντες*, substrati, *γονυκλίνοντες*, genuflectentes, when they were permitted to remain at public prayer but only in a kneeling posture; and, lastly, they were designated as *συνιστάμενοι*, consistentes, when they were permitted, only in a standing posture however, to engage in all parts of public worship, and also to be spectators at the communion. Having passed through all these gradations of public penance, absolution was granted to them, after they had given in a public confession of their sin (*ἐξομολόγησις*). This was certainly a somewhat narrow and stiff method, but it was in the outset employed in a very earnest and solemn spirit. This spirit however did not last a century, and was then gradually displaced by formalism and insincerity.[1]

§ 34.

SCHISMS.

Notwithstanding all the effort to preserve the external unity of the church, various *schisms* were produced in the first centuries by the contest respecting polity, and by the selfish ambition of individuals and parties who diverged from the established ecclesiastical order. Of these, the most important were: that of *Felicissimus* of Carthage, involving the respective claims of the presbyterian and episcopal systems; the *Novatian* at Rome, starting from the same root with that of Felicissimus, and including in addition the question respecting a rigorous or a moderate discipline within the church; and, lastly, the *Meletian* in Egypt, also originating in the subject of discipline, and branching out into the further controversy between episcopacy and hierarchy.

---

[1] The sources for these regulations respecting discipline are found in the canonical letters of Dionysius of Alex., Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Peter of Alex.; though these were written originally only for particular districts.

1. *The schism of Felicissimus at Carthage, in the middle of the 3d century.*[1] Dissatisfied with the election of Cyprian to the bishopric of Carthage, in 248, by a church strongly attached to him, five presbyters sought to render themselves independent of him, and one of them, *Novatus* by name, without consulting the bishop ordained as deacon a certain *Felicissimus*, who afterwards became the head and soul of the growing party opposed to Cyprian. The prudent departure of Cyprian from Carthage during the Decian persecution was represented by this party as a dereliction of duty, and a reason why he should no longer be regarded as bishop. Besides this, there was still another reason why many minds were alienated from Cyprian. Many of the excommunicated Lapsi (§ 26) were desirous of obtaining absolution. It was the opinion of Cyprian that no decision should be made until the persecution had ceased, and that then each case should be judged upon its own merits in a general convention. The Lapsi, however, succeeded in gaining the advocacy of some venerated confessors, and the presbyters received them into church communion without further trial or penance. The pacification which Cyprian was instrumental in bringing about did not continue long. Before returning to his church again, in 251, he proposed making an ecclesiastical visitation to the whole body of churches. Felicissimus and his adherents directly opposed this proposition, and now headed an open division in Cyprian's church, which had by this time become the rendezvous for all discontented persons, and all fickle-minded Lapsi. An opposing bishop, *Fortunatus*, was appointed, who was to exclude Cyprian. Nevertheless, by his own earnestness and firmness, by the coöperation of the other African bishops, and his connection with the Roman bishop, Cyprian finally succeeded in suppressing the schism.

2. *The Novatian schism at Rome, in the middle of the 3d century.*[2] In the Roman church, also, there were two parties

---

[1] See Cypriani Epistolae 38–40. 42. 55.

[2] See Cypr. Epp. 41–52; Dionys. Alex., in Euseb. VI. 45; VII. 8; Novatian, in Socrat. IV. 28; Pacian. episc. Barcel. Epp. 3 Contra Novatianos, in Bibl. Max. Patr. T. IV.

in respect to the subject of church discipline; yet not, as in Carthage, a moderate and a lax one, but a moderate and a strict one. The difference of sentiment, in this instance also, connected itself with the election of a bishop, sometimes as an antecedent and sometimes as a consequent. At the head of the moderate party stood the bishop *Cornelius* appointed 251; the leader of the opposition was the highly esteemed presbyter *Novatian*. Perhaps matters would not have come to a formal rupture had not the presbyter Novatus of Carthage, Cyprian's opponent, joined himself to Novatian as an adherent. This man of restless spirit had come to Rome and connected himself with the anti-episcopal party, although he had previously held a different view respecting church discipline. Soon a formal schism arose, and Novatian was chosen bishop by his party. He sought to obtain the support of the more important churches, and applied to Antioch, Alexandria, and Carthage. Cyprian had previously been inclined to the stricter principles of church discipline, though by no means to the extreme severity of the Novatian theory. Afterwards, through his own reflections, and conference with the African bishops respecting the course to be taken with the great number of the Lapsi, he had come to modify his sentiments upon this subject. He now declared himself the friend of the established order, against the Novatians, and *Dionysius of Alexandria* did the same. Nevertheless the party of the Novatians continued to exist as a distinct sect down into the 4th century. Its fundamental principle was, that no one who had violated his baptismal vow by gross sin, and had been for this reason excommunicated, — even though it might still be possible for him to obtain the divine forgiveness, — should ever be assured of absolution by the church, or be received again into church communion even after the full performance of penance; and that every church who acted contrary to this, thereby lost the character of a pure Christian church. Hence the Novatians were also *οἱ καϑαροί* (Comp. § 72).

3. *The Meletian schism in Egypt, in the beginning of the 4th century.* The ancient accounts of the origin of this

dissension do not agree with each other. Epiphanius (Haer. 68), who by himself alone is not entirely trustworthy, relates that *Meletius*, the metropolitan of Lycopolis in Thebais, separated from his higher metropolitan *Peter* of Alexandria and formed a party, in 306, during the Diocletian persecution, because the latter was in favor of admitting the Lapsi to public penance before persecution had ceased, while he himself contended for delay. Athanasius, on the contrary, a contemporary of Meletius (Apologia contra Arian. § 52), and Socrates (I. 6), relate that Meletius, having been deposed by Peter because he had offered sacrifice and because of other faults, rallied a party in his own support. Lastly, according to a letter of Peter himself (Gallandi Bibl. patr. T. IV. p. 109), and according to Theodoret (I. 9, and Haer. fabb. IV. 7), and Sozomen (I. 23), Meletius was a man of arrogant temper and encroached upon the ecclesiastical domain of Peter, — having illegally undertaken to administer ordination within it, according to a letter of bishop Phileas to Meletius (in Galland. T. IV. p. 67). From all these accounts, it is most probable that Meletius had himself been a Lapsus, and now would proceed with so much the greater severity against the Lapsi, in opposition to the judicious mildness of the Alexandrine bishop Peter, — that for this and other reasons he refused to respect the higher metropolitan rights of the bishop of Alexandria over the whole diocese of Egypt, which the Nicene council at a later day recognized and confirmed, — that he was consequently deposed by Peter, and formed a party in opposition. The council of Nice did indeed externally reconcile the two Egyptian parties; but for a century after, there were clergy in Egypt who would not acknowledge the metropolitan authority of the bishop of Alexandria (Comp. § 71, 3).

SECTION THIRD.

Christian Life and Worship.

Neander Church History, I. 249–335.

§ 35.

CHRISTIAN LIFE.

The Christian church, at all times the salt of the earth, was emphatically in the first centuries of its existence the illuminated city upon the hill, because at that time no external prerogatives, but only sacrifices, dangers, reproaches and sufferings, were connected with the confession of Christianity, and hence by far the most of its confessors were sincere and true ones. In proportion, however, as the church attained peace and prosperity, foreign and impure elements gathered about the genuine germ; but the strict church discipline which prevailed resulted in the separation and rejection of much of the impurity, and the Christian apologists, — a Justin Martyr (Apol. II. al. I.), Tertullian (passim, see Ad Natt. I. 4), Origen (C. Cels. I. 67), — could venture with joy and boldness, in the very presence of the inimical pagan, to point the scorner and persecutor to the lives of the Christians, and particularly to that wonderful transformation by divine power, which made the voluptuous chaste, the avaricious liberal, the man of cursing a man of prayer, the implacable enemy the forgiving friend, converted wrath into gentleness, debauchery into temperance, and vice of thousandfold form into thousandfold virtue.

The life of the Christians was one great whole, animated by the Holy Ghost; "they live in the flesh, but not after the flesh; they dwell upon earth, but they live in heaven; what the soul is in the body, that the Christians are in the world" (Epist. ad Diognet.). The Christian life bore a marked character upon two sides,—the side of *love*, and the side of *strictness*. The essential image of the first pentecostal church, which, "of one heart and one soul, had all things common," repeated itself in the succeeding. Men from the most different nations, who had never before seen each other, immediately recognized one another as by a secret sign, and loved each other as brethren.[1] All believers in Christ were called brethren and sisters, and were such in feeling and reality; and the holy kiss of brotherhood before the communion had not yet become an empty form, an unmeaning or misused sign. Travelling Christians, the poor, the aged, the sick, the widows and orphans, of the church,[2] were carefully provided for by weekly or monthly collections (Justin. M. Apol. I. c. 88; Tertull. Apol. c. 39), and the wealthier churches were glad to send assistance to their suffering brethren in distant lands.[3] But all this loving affection was not a mere effeminate emotion separated from holy earnestness and severity. On the contrary, the pagans continually charged the Christians with a gloomy strictness;[4] and with justice, if despising the sinful pleasures of paganism were such. The Christian, whose aim was a higher one and his joy a truer one,[5] contemned great licentious assemblages, free public festivities, the dance, and theatrical representations of every kind.[1] He, who while a pagan had followed a profession incompatible with strict Christian principle, — the profession of magic (Tertull. De idolatria), of astrology, of image-making, of theatrical exhibition,[2] — must renounce it before baptism, and, in case he were a poor man, was supported in the outset of his new life by the brotherhood. All paganism, "diabolo et pompae et angelis ejus,"[3] was renounced by every

---

[1] "Occultis,—says the pagan Octavius in Minucius Felix c. 9,—occultis se notis et insignibus noscunt, et amant mutuo paene antequam noverint."

[2] In the middle of the 3d century, e. g., the Roman church were providing for more than fifteen hundred widows, and destitute or sick persons (Euseb. VI. 43).

[3] Cyprian collected at Carthage above 4000 dollars (sestertia centum millia nummorum), to aid captive Numidian Christians (Cypr. Ep. 60).

[4] Connected with this, was the charge that they were "infructuosi in negotiis" (Tertull. Apol. c. 42). Tertullian well repels this charge in these words (Apol. c. 43): "plane confitebor, quinam, si forte, vere de sterilitate Christianorum conqueri possunt; primi erunt lenones, perductores, aquarioli; tum sicarii, venenarii, magi . . . ; his infructuosos esse, magnus fructus est."

[5] "Jam nunc,—says Tertullian, De Spectaculis c. 29. while he describes the higher enjoyments of the Christians,—jam nunc si putas delectamentis exigere

---

spatium hoc, cur tam ingratus es, ut tot et tales voluptates a Deo contributas tibi satis non habeas, neque recognoscas? Quid enim jucundius, quam Dei patris et Domini reconciliatio, quam veritatis revelatio, quam errorum recognitio, quam tantorum criminum venia? Quae major voluptas, quam fastidium ipsius voluptatis, quam seculi totius contemptus, quam vera libertas, quam conscientia integra, quam vita sufficiens, quam mortis timor nullus; quod calcas deos nationum, quod daemonia expellis, quod medicinas facis, quod revelationes petis, quod Deo vivis? Hae voluptates, haec spectacula Christianorum, sancta, perpetua, gratuita; in his tibi ludos Circenses interpretare, cursus seculi intuere, tempora labentia, spatia dinumera, metas consummationis expecta, societates ecclesiarum defende, ad signum Dei suscitare, ad tubam angeli erigere, ad martyrii palmas gloriare. Si scenicae doctrinae delectant, satis nobis literarum est, satis versuum est, satis sententiarum, satis etiam canticorum, satis vocum, nec fabulae, sed veritates, nec strophae, sed simplicitates. Vis et pugillatus et luctatus? Praesto sunt, non parva, sed multa. Adspice impudicitiam dejectam a castitate, perfidiam caesam a fide, saevitiam a misericordia contusam, petulentiam a modestia obumbratam, et tales sunt apud nos agones, in quibus ipsi coronamur. Vis autem et sanguinis aliquid? habes Christi. Quale autem spectaculum in proximo est adventus Domini jam indubitati, jam superbi, jam triumphantis? Quae illa exsultatio angelorum, quae gloria resurgentium sanctorum, quale regnum exinde justorum, qualis civitas nova Hierusalem!"

[1] The strictness of the early Christians forbade under penalty attendance upon spectacles, — not merely those of a cruel kind (Irenaeus Adv. Haer. I. 6), but those of gayety also (Tertull. De Spect. c. 15, 23, 26; Apologet. c. 38; Minuc. Felix Octav. c. 12), — so that the pagans regarded this as the shibboleth of Christianity (Tert. De spect. c. 24). The profession and business itself of theatrical representations was still more strictly forbidden (Cypr. Epist. 6. ad Euchrat; Comp. Concil. Illiberit. can. 62).

[2] There were different judgments with regard to serving in the armies of the pagan emperors (Comp. Tertull. Apolog. c. 42, and in De corona mil.). Only a portion of the church would entirely forbid holding office under the heathen government (Comp. Tertull. Apolog. c. 38); while another portion would allow it conditionally (Comp. Concil. Illiberit. c. 56).

[3] Tertull. De spectaculis c. 4. According to Constitt. Apost VII. 41, the candidate for baptism declared: *ἀποτάσσομαι τῷ Σατανᾶ καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ καὶ ταῖς πομπαῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ ταῖς λατρείαις αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ ταῖς ἐφευρέσεσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπ᾽ αὐτόν.*

Christian at baptism, and this solemn "sacramentum militiae Christianae," all valiant "milites Dei et Christi contra copias diaboli"[1] kept sacred their whole life long.

There were also individuals among the first Christians, who, on leaving the corrupt life of heathenism, and entering the church, were filled with such an intense desire to be entirely surrendered to God, that they now renounced the world altogether, lived unmarried, gave their property for pious uses, lived in the most sparing manner, and divided the proceeds of their daily labor among the poor. These ancient *'Ασκηταί,* Continentes, lived in the midst of the churches, or at least, as in Egypt particularly, near the cities and villages, in free intercourse with the body of believers, ministering to their brethren by their spiritual knowledge and experience.[2] The first, and for a long time the only, example in this period of an Anchorite or Eremite, was *Paul* of Thebes in Egypt, who at the age of fifteen fled from the Decian persecution into a neighboring desert, and continued to live a solitary life. He died about the year 340 upwards of one hundred years old.[3] His career was first brought to public notice by *Antony*, who discovered his corpse in a praying posture, and buried it. Speaking generally, the most healthy and blooming Christian life of this period afforded no support or nourishment to monastic tendencies. This tendency is opposed by Clement of Alexandria (Stromat. III. p. 446, and in the tract Quis dives salvetur); and also by Hermas (Pastor lib. III. simil. 5).

---

[1] Comp. Tertull. Ad mart. c. 3; also Ignat. Epist. ad Polyc. c. 6.

[2] Of these ascetics, the so-called *παρθένοι*, virgines, males as well as females (Tertull. De cultu feminar. II. 9), constituted a highly regarded portion, and one through whom the notion of a peculiar sanctity in celibacy already began to become current (Concil. Illiberit. can. 33). This virginity, moreover, assumed a very vain appearance, particularly among the females (Cyprian, De habitu virginum, compared with Tertull. De virgg. vel. c. 14), and, in the case of the so-called Subintroductae, *Συνείσακτοι*, (i. e. female assistants who were not wives) a suspiciously bold form (Cyprian. Epist. 62. ad Pompon).

[3] Hieronymi Vita Pauli Eremitae; translated in Bibliotheca Sacra, 1844.

§ 36.

PUBLIC RELIGIOUS ASSEMBLIES AND SERVICES.

The whole life of the Christian, as "one great continual prayer" (Origen De orat. c. 12), was regarded as in itself a worship of God. But in order to the support and furtherance of the Christian faith and life, particular religious assemblings were requisite, which, naturally with some formality of arrangement and yet with no superstitious reliance upon externals (Orig. C. Cels. VIII. 20 seq.), constituted a part of the entire system of spiritual training for the church. The description of the services in these Christian assemblies is derived from Justin Martyr (Apol. II. p. 98, Ed. Col.), compared with Tertullian (Apologet. c. 39; see also Plinii Ep. ad Trajan., supra § 23, 1). First, a passage of scripture was read from the Old or New Testament. In the first days of the church, the passage was taken from the Old Testament alone, and most often from the prophets; but afterwards, as early as Justin's time, from the New Testament also, — first from the evangelists, and then from the apostolical epistles.[1] The scriptures were read in a language which the hearers understood; consequently in the Greek or Latin[2] in the Roman empire, and in case neither of these languages was familiar to the assembly, and there was no version in the native tongue, the meaning was given by an interpreter of their own appointment.[3] Then, the bishop or a presbyter delivered a didactic and edifying discourse founded upon the passage that had been read, with a practical application to those present. After this, the whole assembly rose up and each one silently offered prayer for himself, for the welfare of the church, for the conversion of all mankind, for the government, and for the peace of the State. Then, each gave the other the kiss of brotherly love. A prayer of consecration and thanksgiving was then offered by the bishop, to which all responded with the final Amen. The service was then concluded with the communion of the Lord's Supper, of which all baptized persons who were not under church censure partook. From the very earliest times, this entire public service[1] was inspired and elevated by the singing of spiritual lyrics,[2] in accordance with both the example and precept of Christ and his apostles (Matt. xxvi. 30; Acts xvi. 25; James v. 13; Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16). These lyrics were, partly, the Old Testament psalms, and biblical hymns, — such for example as the so-called *τρισάγιον* (Isaiah vi. 3),[3] together with the so-called lesser (Rev. i. 6),[4] and greater (Luke ii. 14), doxologies; and, partly, songs of praise and thanksgiving specially composed for public worship.[5]

---

[1] In this period, some other writings besides canonical were read in the churches, because the decision had not been made regarding their canonicity; e.g. the Shepherd of Hermas (Euseb. III. 3), the first Epistle of Clemens Rom. (Euseb. III. 16). Afterwards only canonical writings were read by authority, although the order of the Council of Hippo (A. D. 393, can. 36) forbidding the reading of uncanonical writings was not always obeyed.

[2] Several Latin versions of the New Testament were very early made, according to Augustine (De doctrina Christ. II. 11).

[3] All persons were exhorted to read the scriptures in private, in the early church; he who had no copy of his own should read with the bishop. See Walch Vom Gebrauch der h. Schrift in den vier ersten Jahrhh.

§ 37.

PLACES OF WORSHIP.

The temple at Jerusalem (Acts ii. 46) was the first place of common assemblage for the Christians; not however to the exclusion of a private place which had been consecrated and hallowed by the events of the day of Pentecost (Acts ii.

---

[1] As well as family worship also, according to Tertull. Ad uxor. II. 9.

[2] Respecting the manner of singing, see Constitt. Apost. II. 57 (*ἕτερός τις τοῦ Δαβὶδ ψαλλέτω ὕμνους, καὶ ὁ λαὸς τὰ ἀκροστίχια ὑποψαλλέτω*).

[3] Baumgarten Historia Trisagii.

[4] Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto in secula seculorum. Amen. (Const. Ap. VIII. 12.)

[5] Euseb. V. 28, and Plin. Ep. ad Traj.

1, 2). As they were soon compelled to leave the temple, at first nothing remained but the halls in private houses in which they could assemble.[1] Gradually, some fixtures and arrangements were made in these rooms, to adapt them better to the purposes of a public meeting; particularly an elevated platform for the speaker (suggestus, pulpitum), and a table for the ministration of the Lord's Supper, which latter as early as the end of the 2d century was denominated ara, altare. Not until the 3d century,[2] and particularly during the reign of Diocletian, were church edifices constructed, and only in a moderate style of architecture.[3]

In memory of their martyrs, the Christians in this period assembled also in their burial places (*κοιμητήρια*, dormitoria), which were sometimes, particularly in Rome,[4] artificially constructed in subterranean galleries, and were for this reason specially adapted for religious meetings during times of persecution.

Images were banished from the first Christian church edifices, as an approach to paganism. Sensuous figures were regarded as unworthy of the spiritual nature of Christianity, as well as being forbidden in the Old Testament. This rejection of material representations was natural and salutary; without it Christianity, especially in the first period of its existence, must inevitably have been corrupted by the admixture of pagan elements. Figures of a religious kind were first employed in household life. Instead of the pagan figures upon cups, rings, etc., the Christians substituted those of a symbolically Christian character; e. g. the image of a shepherd carrying a lamb upon his shoulders (Tertull. De pudicit. c. 7), of a dove (Clem. Alex. Paedag. III. p. 246), of a ship sailing towards the sky, of an anchor, of a lute, of a fish, — this latter referring partly to the miraculous draught of fishes, partly to regeneration and the baptismal water, and partly to the monogram *ἰχθύς*,[1] i. e. *Ἰ-ησοῦς Χ-ριστὸς Θ-εοῦ Υ-ἱὸς Σ-ωτήρ.* This use of figures in private houses was the occasion of their use in many churches also, as early as the 3d century,—a practice, however, which the Synod of Elvira (Illiberis) in Spain, in the year 305, forbade.[2] The sign of the cross very early found entrance into the household life of the Christians (Tertull. De cor. mil. c. 3; Comp. De orat. c. 29), and from thence into the churches.[3] As early as the 3d century, many ascribed a supernatural efficacy to it.[4]

---

[1] Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 19, 20; Rom. xvi. 5; Philem. 2, together with Acta Justini M. § 3.

[2] Tertull. De idolatr. c. 7.

[3] In Clemen's Alex. Strom. VII. p. 846, they already bear the name *ἐκκλησίαι*; in Euseb. VII. 30, they are denominated *οἶκοι ἐκκλησιῶν*; they are also called *κυριακά, προσευκτήρια*, and, in the 4th century, templa.

[4] Jerom. in Ezekiel, 40.

§ 38.

RELIGIOUS DAYS AND FESTIVALS.

Through the remembrance of the great facts of the gospel, every day becomes holy for the Christian, and hence the first brotherhood assembled daily for mutual edification (Acts ii. 46).[5] But as one day of the week, preëminently, had been hallowed for the Patriarchal and Jewish churches by God's own act (Gen. ii. 2 seq.; Exodus xx. 8—11), so, on the completion of the old economy and in the beginning of the new, by a new divine act,—the resurrection of Christ and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost,—one day of the week was preeminently hallowed for the Christian church. The first was a monumentum creationis, the last a monumentum consummationis.

1. In each week, consequently, the great solemn festival

---

[1] Tertull. De bapt. c. 1.

[2] Can. 36. "Ne quod colitur et adoratur, in parietebus depingatur."

[3] Constitt. Apost. VIII. 12; comp Gretser De sancta cruce.

[4] See Münter Sinnbilder und Kunstvorstellungen der alten Christen; Muratori De templor. apud vett Christ. ornatu; Jablonski De origine imaginum Christi in ecclesia.

[5] Constitt. Apost. II 59 (*ἑκάστης ἡμέρας συναθροίζεσθε . . . . . ψάλλοντες καὶ προσευχόμενοι ἐν τοῖς κυριακοῖς*); VIII. 35—39.

of the Christians was the *Lord's Day* (Sunday), *ἡμέρα τοῦ Κυρίου*, dies dominica, hallowed by the remembrance of the risen Redeemer, and, in the early church (comp. Barnabas Ep. c. 15), by the expectation of his future advent, and also by the recollection of the pentecostal effusion of the Holy Ghost. The first traces of the observance of the Christian Sabbath, which in the 2d century had become universal (Justin Apol. I. c. 67;[1] Plin. Epp. X. 96[2]), are found in John xx. 19, 26; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; and still more distinctly in Rev. i. 10, where it is expressly denominated "the Lord's day."[3] Tertullian's testimony (De orat. c. 23), at the close of the 2d century, evinces that secular labor upon Sunday was regarded as a sinful tempting of God.[4] Inasmuch as the Lord's day was a day of praise and thanksgiving, the Christians did not fast upon it (Tertull. De cor. mil. c. 3), and prayed standing instead of kneeling (Irenaeus, fragm. de pasch.). Besides the observance of the Christian Sabbath, the Jewish-Christians continued to observe the Sabbath of the old dispensation, *τὸ σάββατον*,[5] and in this way the custom prevailed, in the Oriental church, of distinguishing the seventh day of the week also by not fasting and not kneeling in prayer, while in the Western church, on the contrary, the Jewish Sabbath was regarded as a fast day, in opposition to Judaism and Judaizing tendencies. The ancient church observed *Friday* and *Wednesday*, in each week, in commemoration of the Passion of Christ, and of the circumstances that prepared for it. These two days,—feria sexta (*ἡ παρασκευή*, parasceve, עֶרֶב שַׁבָּת[6]) and feria quarta (*ἡ τετράς*), also called figuratively dies stationum as the watch days of the militia Christiana,—were kept, in part, as days of humiliation, prayer, and fasting; these special religious acts not continuing after three in the afternoon. Hence these days were also denominated semi-jejunia.[1]

---

[1] "*Τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέραν κοινῇ πάντες τὴν συνέλευσιν ποιούμεθα κ. τ. λ.*"

[2] "Quod essent soliti stato die . . . convenire carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere" cet.

[3] Comp Ignat. Ep. ad Magnes. c. 9.

[4] "Differentes etiam negotia, ne quem diabolo locum demus."

[5] Constitutt. Apost. II. 59; VII. 23; and Can. Apost. 68.

[6] Routh Reliqu. Sacrae III. 343.

2. The custom of celebrating *yearly festivals* probably came from the Jewish-Christians, who continued to observe the Jewish feasts, though transferring to them a Christian significance. The first annual festival was: —

a. The *Easter* festival, the *Passover,* in memory of the death and resurrection of the Lord.[2]

Respecting the time of observing the annual feast of the passover, there was a dispute between the Western and other Gentile-Christian churches on the one hand, and the Jewish-Christian communities, together with the Asia-Minor churches who stood in close connection with them, on the other.[3] The latter (Euseb. V. 23) would observe the Jewish passover, since Christ himself had observed it, and hence held it upon the night between the 14th and 15th of the Jewish month Nisan. Upon the following day, whatever day of the week it might be, they commemorated the Passion of Christ (*πάσχα σταυρώσιμον, παρασκευή*), by fasting as did all Christians, and on the third day after they celebrated the feast of the resurrection (*πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον*). The former, on the contrary, contended that the Jewish paschal-supper need not be observed, — nay, that a feast in the season of humiliation and fasting[4] in remembrance of the death of Christ was very unbefitting. Hence they substituted in the place of the paschal-supper, a communion at the beginning of the feast of the resurrection. These churches, moreover, invariably celebrated the feast of the resurrection of Christ upon a Sunday, and that of his death upon a Friday. It was certainly impossible to convict the reckoning of the Jewish-Christians of an error in regard to the day of Christ's death, and the time of his last supper immediately preceding his passion. The narrative of the evangelists is plain, and there was no reason for the assertion that that last supper was not the actual Jewish-paschal supper, but a substituted one. Yet it was an error in the Jewish-Christians, to insist upon the permanent establishment of a Jewish festival for the Christian church, upon the ground of a temporary accommodation to it on the part of Christ. Certainly the theory and practice of the Gentile-Christians, taken as a whole, was more worthy of the free spirit of the Christian church, even though it be more difficult to evince its conformity with the literal data of the evangelical history.

---

[1] The observance of these days was to some extent voluntary. Only the Montanists insisted upon a rigid observance of all the particulars, and they lengthened the fasting (Tertull. De jejun. c. 1).

[2] The name *πάσχα* (פֶּסַח, פַּסְחָא) denotes, first, the Jewish passover-meal and the feast immediately following; and then, more generally, the feast in memory of Christ's death and resurrection (Tertull. De jejun. c. 14; De orat. c. 14; De cor. mil. c. 3).

[3] Heumann vera descriptio priscae contentionis de vero paschate; Neander Erläuterung über de ältesten Passahstreitigkeiten, in Kirchenhistor. Archiv. 1823.

[4] This was the only regular and established fast in the early church, — from which, afterwards, the Quadrigesimal fast of forty days was made (Irenaeus, in Euseb. V. 24).

This diversity in usage first became a subject of discussion in the church, about the year 160, at the time of a visit of the bishop Polycarp of Smyrna to Anicetus bishop of Rome (Euseb. V. 24). Anicetus appealed to the tradition in the Roman church; Polycarp cited the fact that he had himself observed the paschal-supper with the apostle John. Each bishop abode by the custom of his own church; but in token of altogether undisturbed fraternal fellowship, notwithstanding this difference in regard to externals, Anicetus invited Polycarp to administer the communion in his own church. Nevertheless scruples arose in Asia Minor respecting the matter; the Gentile-Christian usage was attacked about the year 170 by bishop Claudius Apollinaris of Hierapolis, in a work to which a reply was made by Melito of Sardis. No separation in the church, however, was the result at this time (Euseb. IV. 26). About the year 196, a new and more earnest strife broke out between the Asia-Minor, and the Western, bishops, under the lead of Polycrates of Ephesus and Victor of Rome,[1] and Victor so far lost sight of the example of his venerable predecessor Anicetus, that he renounced fellowship with his opponents. This was, however, by no means the feeling of the entire West; and Irenaeus of Lyons and Vienne addressed him a very affectionate, but at the same time humbling letter. The discrepancy between the two parties still continued to the close of this period.

---

[1] The following Eastern churches, however, sided with Victor: Caesarea, Jerusalem, Pontus, Osrhoene, Corinth, Tyre, Ptolemais, Alexandria.

b. To Easter was added *Whitsunday*, *Πεντηκοστή,* corresponding to the Jewish Pentecost (§ 12). This festival, strictly considered, was the fiftieth day after Easter, and commemorated the effusion of the Holy Ghost; but the custom prevailed very early of keeping not *merely* the fiftieth day, but the whole fifty days from Easter, as a feast, in memory of the glorification of the risen Redeemer, of whose exaltation the outpouring of the Spirit was one of the mightiest consequences.

c. *Christmas*, in the early church, was a festival which was overshadowed by the two above-mentioned festivals; as, indeed, the birth of Christ was a less emphatic fact in the mind of the church of this age, than his death and resurrection. It was observed only in some individual churches in this period (Comp. Clem. Alex. Stromata I. p. 340, ed. Sylb. Col.), and probably first in the West.

d. The feast in commemoration of Christ's baptism in Jordan, and of the first manifestation of his Messianic dignity, was probably observed first only in Palestine and Syria; afterwards it was denominated *τὰ Ἐπιφάνια τοῦ Χριστοῦ,* and also *ἡ Ἐπιφάνεια.*

e. Lastly, to the annual festivals of this period belonged also the anniversaries of the Martyrs, dies natales or natalitia martyrum, *ἡμέραι γενέθλιοι* or *τὰ γενέθλια τῶν μαρτύρων,* — as their birth-day for a higher life. Upon these anniversaries the churches assembled at the tombs of the martyrs. The narrative of their sufferings was read, the martyrs were particularly mentioned in the public prayers, and the communion was celebrated in the vivid consciousness of the enduring communion between the living believer and those who sleep in Jesus.[1]

[1] The church at Smyrna, in the reign of Aurelius, specifies as the true end in celebrating the anniversaries of the martyrs, that it should contribute εἴς τε τῶν

Christian assemblies were sometimes convened, in this period, in the solemn stillness and under the protection of the night, as *Vigiliae*, *Pervigilia*. The synod of Elvira, in 305, forbade the presence of females at these nocturnal meetings. The Vigils of the night preceding Easter morning were the most universally observed (*αἱ παννυχίδες*, vigiliae paschales; Comp. Tertull. Ad uxor. II. 4; Constitt. Ap. V. 19; Lactant. Inst. VII. 19; Hieron. in Matth. xxv. 6), — a solemn night-service which, with singing, reading of Scripture, and preaching, lasted till Easter morning. The opinion was somewhat prevalent in the church that upon this night Christ would make his advent in glory.

§ 39.

CELEBRATION OT THE SACRAMENTS.

1. *Baptism.* All adults who sought reception into the church by baptism, were first prepared for this step as catechumens, *κατηχούμενοι*, audientes, by clergymen or instructed laymen, *κατηχηταί*, doctores audientium.[1] As the time drew near, the catechumen committed to memory a confession of faith which was founded upon the baptismal formula in Matt. xxviii. 19, and expressed belief in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in opposition to Pagans, Jews, and Heretics. At his baptism, he publicly professed this creed, which embraced the more essential parts of the Christian system as given by the apostles (the *Παράδοσις τῆς ἐκκλησίας, παράδοσις ἀποστολική*), and was at a later day commonly called *Σύμβο-*

προηϑληκότων μνήμην, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἄσκησίν τε καὶ ἑτοιμασίαν (Euseb. IV. 15). In answer to the objection sometimes urged, that the reverence for the martyrs was excessive, they say: *Χριστὸν μὲν γὰρ υἱόν ὄντα τοῦ ϑεοῦ προσκυνοῦμεν τοὺς δὲ μάρτυρας ὡς μαϑητὰς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ μιμητὰς ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως . . . . . . ὧν γένοιτο καὶ ἥμας συγκοινωνοὺς καὶ συμμαϑητὰς γενέσϑαι.*

[1] The synod of Elvira, in 305, fixed the length of time for catechetical instruction at two years, — the Apostolical Constitutions (VIII. 32) at three.

λον ἀποστολικόν.[1] With this profession of faith, was connected in the 2d century the vow (see § 35) to renounce the devil and his works (Tertull. De spectacc. c. 4; Comp. Constitt. Ap. VII. 41).

Before the close of this period, the apostolic origin of *Infant Baptism* was generally acknowledged in theory, in the church, although the rite was not universally practised, particularly in the East. That this rite was actually practised by the Apostles themselves is not, indeed, capable of a strict and absolute demonstration from New Testament data; but a large number of passages in the New Testament (Mark xvi. 16; ix. 36 seq.; Matt. xviii. 6; Mark x. 13 seq.; John iii. 5; Acts ii. 39; xvi. 33; particularly 1 Cor. vii. 14,—none of which are necessarily contradicted by Matt. xxviii. 19), taken in connection with the intimate association, in the Scripture representation, of baptism with regeneration by the Holy Spirit (Titus iii. 5, and other places),—with the doctrine of the innate corruption of all mankind,—with the fact of the occasional exertion of direct spiritual influence from the first commencement of the individual life (Luke i. 15, 41–52),—with the fact that Christianity is a method of salvation for

---

[1] Denominated "Apostolical," not because it was literally drawn up by the Apostles, but because it contains the doctrine taught by them, and received in the Catholic church of this period. In the writings of the fathers of the first three centuries,—Comp. Irenaeus Adv. Haer. I. 10; III. 4; Tertull. De virgg. vel. c. 1; Adv. Prax. c. 2; De praescrr. haer. c. 13; Origen De princ. prooem. § 4; Cypr. Ep. 71,—there are confessions which harmonize with the so-called Apostles Creed in sentiment, but vary in phraseology both from it and each other. The present Apostolical symbol undoubtedly stands in the closest connection with the old formulas used at baptism in the apostolic churches. The first confession of Christian faith upon which the church built its symbolism was the answer of Peter to the question of Christ (Matt. xvi 16). A similar simple confession was, without doubt, required of candidates for baptism in the time of the apostles (Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 12; Acts viii. 37; 1 Tim. iii. 16). The simplest, briefest, form had already been given in the baptismal formula itself (Matt. xxviii. 19). The so-called Symbolum Romanum was probably an older form than the present "Apostle's Creed," though essentially the same with it; the Symbolum Aquileiense, and Symbolum Orientale, of which portions are preserved in Rufinus (Expositio in Symbolum apost), are later, as are also the Regulae fidei in Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian and others See Pearson on the Creed; Harvey on the Creeds; King on the Apostle's Creed; Witsius Exercc. in symb. ap.; Walch Antiquitt. symb.; Guericke Symbolik.

mankind, and not solely for youth and adults, — with the fact that the new covenant is a continuation of the old, and not less comprehensive in its promises and provisional arrangements, — all this, if considered in connection with the reasons for the rite arising from the idea and structure of the family, in which the child from the very first is subjected to the moulding of the Christian parent, renders it probable in the highest degree, that infant baptism *immediately* took the place of the circumcision of the Old Testament Church, in the same natural and spontaneous manner in which the Christian Sabbath took the place of the Jewish. Moreover it is certainly improbable in the very highest degree, that as early as the 3d century, without apostolical example and authority, and still more in known opposition to it, an ordinance like infant baptism, which has since been maintained in universal Christendom, in all centuries, in opposition to fanaticism of various kinds, should have had such authority with minds like Origen (Homil. 14. in Luc., in Rom. v. 9), and Cyprian (Ep. 59), and others.[1] That infant baptism was claimed to be an apostolical ordinance certainly as early as the 2d century, is evinced by the opposition to it by Tertullian (De bapt. c. 18), who speaks of it as a prevalent custom; and by the passage in Irenaeus Adv. Haer. II. 22, 4, which has been often misinterpreted by modern writers.[2] It was infant baptism, undoubtedly, that led to the appointment of baptismal witnesses, Sponsores, who made the profession of faith in the place of the children (Tertull. De bapt. c. 18).

Baptism was originally performed by immersion in the name of the trinity, (by Marcion, in the name of Jesus simply). In case of the administration of the rite to the sick, sprinkling was substituted for immersion, — a mode of baptism which Cyprian (Ep. 76) defends as entirely valid. The time for baptism was not a set time at first. After the 2d century, Easter-Sunday and Whitsunday were regarded as the proper seasons for this rite (Tertull. De bapt. c. 19); and in the Eastern church the feast of the Epiphany also. Cyprian (Ep. 59), and a Carthaginian synod about 252, decided that infants should be baptized within the second or third day after birth. The candidates for baptism presented themselves in white garments. As early as the beginning of the 3d century, the custom prevailed of anointing the baptized person with an oil, χρίσμα, consecrated for this purpose, as a symbol of the spiritual priesthood of Christians (Tertull. De bapt. c. 7; Cypr. Ep. 70). In the age of the Apostles (Acts viii. 16, 17), the laying on of hands by the officiating person was connected with baptism, as the sign of the imparting of the Holy Ghost. This act, which had only a temporary import, was afterwards made specially prominent (Comp. Cypr. Ep. 72, 73, and De rebaptismate), and then connected with the act of anointing. After the 3d century, it was regarded as the peculiar function of the bishop, under the name of Confirmation, Confirmatio, and was administered only when the bishop administered baptism, and at the same time.

---

[1] Comp. also Constitt. Apost. vi. 15; βαπτίζετε ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ νήπια.

[2] That this passage not merely enunciates the idea from which infant baptism must have proceeded, but justifies the rite itself, has been shown by Thiersch, in Rudelbach and Guericke's Zeitschrift. 1841. Upon the history of infant baptism: See Walch Hist. Paedobaptismi. Wall History of Infant Baptism. Beecher on Baptism.

A controversy respecting the *Baptism of heretics* arose in the middle of the 3d century, between the Romish bishop Stephen and Cyprian of Carthage, with the latter of whom all the North-African churches sided, at three synods held at Carthage in 255 and 256. Cyprian, following the traditional theory prevailing in the churches of Asia Minor, North Africa,[1] and Alexandria, held that baptism possessed validity only when administered within the pale of the true Catholic church, and consequently that the rite when performed in heretical churches was invalid, and the converted heretic upon admission into the Catholic church must receive a true and real baptism (Cypr. Ep. 70 seq.).[2] Stephen, on the contrary, following the tradition of the Roman church, contended that all baptism administered in the name of the Triune God, nay in the name of Christ alone, was by this very fact valid, and hence that baptism should not be repeated, but the converted heretic should merely receive confirmation of baptism at the hands of the bishop, thereby becoming a member of the true church and receiving the Holy Ghost. Stephen went so far, in his opposition, as to exclude the African churches from fellowship, as he had previously excluded those of Asia Minor in 253; for which he received the serious rebuke of Firmilian of Caesarea (Cypr. Ep. 75), and of the mild bishop Dionysius of Alexandria (Euseb. VII. 5). Subsequently, a middle view of the subject, though for substance more Romish than North African, became the prevailing one (Can. 8. Conc. Arelat. A. D. 314). Baptism in the name of the Trinity, but not in the name of Christ alone, was declared to be valid.

---

[1] Tertullian had expressly declared (Bapt. 15): "Non idem Deus est nobis et illis (haereticis), nec unus Christus est idem. Ideoque nec baptismus unus," cet.

[2] "Non rebaptizari, sed baptizari a nobis, quicunque ab adultera et profana aqua veniunt abluendi salutaris aquae veritate" — Cypr. Ep. 73.

2. *The Lord's Supper.* As often as the churches assembled for religious service, which at first was daily, and afterwards every Sabbath, (Justin. Apol. II. p. 98, ed. Col.) the communion was celebrated. After the prayer of thanksgiving (hence this sacrament came to be denominated *εὐχαριστία*), with which the bishop[1] consecrated the gifts offered by the brotherhood, — viz.: common bread, and wine generally mingled with water, — the deacons carried the bread and wine to all the church members present, in regular order, and then, after the assembly were dismissed, to the absent sick, prisoners, and strangers. In many churches, as for example the North-African, each member took home a portion of the consecrated bread, and then partook of it with his family after the morning prayer (Tertull. Ad uxor. lib. II. c. 5). In the same North-African church, the custom of admitting children to the communion prevailed (Cypr. De lapsis). Though contrary to the apostolic injunction in 1 Cor. xi. 28,

---

[1] In case of his absence, a presbyter; (Comp. Justin. Apol. II.; Ignat. Ad Smyr. p. 168; Apost. Constit. VIII. 13).

the advocates of this custom put a literal construction upon John vi. 53, and appealed to it in justification.[1]

The originally very simple act of administering the Lord's Supper, after the 3d century assumed greater complexity and more external show. By this time Liturgies, λειτουργίαι, were employed for the more splendid observance of the Eucharist, differing in different churches. In the Oriental churches they were long and complicated, with frequent chorals and responses of the congregation between the alternating prayers of the bishop and deacon, while in the Western they were shorter, having neither choral nor response.

In this period, we often find the sacrament of the Supper denominated a *sacrifice*, oblatio, προσφορά, sacrificium, ϑυσία (Comp. Justin Dial. p. 200; Irenaeus Adv. Haer. IV. 18; Cyprian De opere et eleemos.). It was not, however, until the 3d century, that the germ distinctly appears of the later idea of the Lord's Supper as a sacrificial offering presented by the Christian priest,—or of the "mass." Previously the Lord's Supper had been termed a sacrifice in a symbolical sense merely; partly, with reference to the voluntary offering of bread and wine, for the ordinance, by the church, who thus expressed their readiness to surrender their all for the service of God; partly, with reference to the consecrating prayer before the communion, considered as a spiritual thank-offering for the blessings obtained through Christ; and partly, with reference to the sacrament itself, as being a memorial of the sacrifice offered by Christ once for all.

With the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the church in the first ages was accustomed to connect the *Love Feast*, ἀγάπη (Acts ii. 46; 1 Cor. xi. 20 seq.; Ep. Plin. ad Traj. above § 23, 1), in commemoration of the last meal of Christ with his disciples which preceded the institution of the Sacrament. Irregularities, difficult to be avoided in the larger and more heterogeneous churches (as that of Corinth in the time of Paul), very soon gave occasion for separating the Agapae from the sacrament of the Supper, and they were now observed separately,— yet, notwithstanding the varieties in rank and condition in the church, in the full consciousness of equality before God, and of fraternal fellowship. The love feast began with prayer, next succeeded a moderate repast, then edifying discourse followed by singing of hymns of praise to Christ, — the whole concluding with prayer (Tertull. Apologet. c. 39). Yet, already in this period, on account of local reasons, or because of the suspicion of the pagans, or by reason of incoming abuses, the churches were beginning, here and there, to abstain from the observance of this feast.

---

[1] Comp. Augustine, De peccator. meritis et bapt. parv. I. 20. This custom has been preserved in the Oriental church, while in the Western it disappeared in the 12th century.

It was an early custom for the bride and bridegroom to partake of the communion, in the case of marriages occurring under the advice of the church (Tertull. Ad uxor. II. 8); and for the friends and kindred of deceased believers, and of martyrs, to celebrate the Sacrament upon the anniversary of their death (Tertull. De cor. mil. c. 3; De exhort. cast. c. 11; Cypr. Ep. 66). These usages, in connection with others, contributed to plant the germ of the superstitious conceptions of the Sacrament that afterwards prevailed.

SECTION FOURTH.

History of Doctrine.[1]

§ 40.

GENERAL SURVEY.

Upon the foundation of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments on the one side, and the Apostolic interpretation of them on the other, the doctrinal system of Christianity, even in this early period, obtained a fixed form in all its essential parts. The New-Testament dogma was derived from the *New-Testament Canon*, which, by the end of the 2d century, had become acknowledged in nearly its present form, in all parts of Christendom.[2] The principal features of the systematic interpretation, by the Apostles, of this dogmatic material, had been preserved in the so-called *Apostle's Symbol* (§ 39, 1). Fidelity to the New Testament canon and the Apostolical creed would, therefore, naturally result in a dogmatic construction of Christianity, in which nothing *essential* would be lacking. Still it was not strange, considering the powerful struggle with external opposition which Christianity was forced to pass through in this period, that this doctrinal material should fail to receive a complete treatment, or that some indefiniteness, and even arbitrariness, should appear in the theological science of the first ages. Many individual points of doctrine, as the history of doctrines will show, still remained more or less undetermined, and the development of the essential substance of the Christian system, in the case even of some of the most distinguished fathers of this period, took very diverse, and in some instances not entirely scriptural, and catholic directions. Yet these differences between distinguished minds neither entered as integral parts into the received symbolical constructions of the church, nor did they become the subject of general debate and controversy in oecumenical councils. But in proportion as these diversities, in the modes in which individual minds treated the one catholic system of doctrine, were the more plainly visible, so much the more remarkable was the fidelity and firmness with which the *whole church* of this period victoriously resisted, not only all the attacks from Judaism and Paganism, but also the great number of heretical sects which were continually breaking in upon its unity and peace, — a sure testimony not only in regard to the scope, but also to the validity, of that body of systematic truth which had already, in this early period, obtained currency as the doctrinal system of the Universal Christian church.

---

[1] For the literature, see Introduction, p. 9, Note 1.

[2] At the close of the 2d century, the three leading and representative minds in the Church, — Irenaeus in Asia Minor and afterwards in Gaul, Tertullian in North Africa and previously in Rome, and Clemens Alexandrinus in Egypt, — agreed entirely in the express recognition, as canonical, of the so-called ὁμολογούμενα, viz.: the four Gospels, thirteen Epistles of Paul, the First Epistle of Peter, the First Epistle of John, and the Apocalypse. The ἀντιλεγόμενα, viz.: Hebrews, Jude, 2d and 3d of John, James, and 2d Peter, were the subject of more or less dispute, although almost every one of them found the advocate of its canonicity in the authorities of the day. In the 3d century, Origen mentions *all* the New Testament writings as they are now received, though he himself doubts the Pauline origin of Hebrews, and states that 2d Peter, 2d and 3d John, James, and Jude, were not *universally* received. Eusebius does the same in the 4th century, though more inclined to accept the Pauline origin of Hebrews, while on the contrary he doubts, as had Dionysius of Alexandria before him, the apostolical origin of the Apocalypse. The Antilegomena gradually acquired authority upon historical grounds, and from their homogeneity with the Homologoumena; so that towards the end of the 4th century, the Canon of the N. T. in its present form

In a *General Survey of the doctrinal development of the Christian church in the first three centuries*, we observe the following particulars.

---

was entirely settled. The Council of Laodicea, about 360, determined the Canon very nearly as we now have it, and that of Hippo, in 393, established it in its full and final integrity. See Guericke Einleitung ins N. T.

As the basis of it, Christ himself, and, after him, his Apostles divinely illuminated by the Holy Ghost, had communicated the gospel in the entire fulness and comprehensiveness of its substantial matter; the latter preserving, amidst all the variety in their modes of apprehension and forms of statement, unity both in spirit and doctrine. The post-apostolic age now endeavored to make itself master of this rich fund of dogmatic materials, and, in accordance with its immediate wants, to convert it into clear conceptions and systematic forms. In this endeavor, *two tendencies* soon began to display themselves in divergence from each other, which required the discussions and controversies of some centuries to conciliate and harmonize, in the distinct and fixed oecumenical symbols that were the result of these polemics. These tendencies were the following:—

In strict opposition to a heretical and anti-church idealism, which in its narrow speculation separated the ideal from the historical, the divine from the human, the contemplative from the practical, thus tearing asunder that which is found joined together in living union in the Christian revelation,—in strictest opposition to this *Gnosticism*, a *practical church tendency* was very early established, particularly in the East. The first representatives of this tendency were the Apostolic Fathers, particularly Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp. These were succeeded in the 2d and 3d centuries by Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian, who earnestly, and firmly, and in various modes, asserted the independence of the Christian faith against the caprices of a misnamed philosophical speculation, and developed and defended the essential truths of the Christian system, in opposition to the defective and erroneous explanation of them by the Gnostic. But even the most distinguished minds of this class were themselves not altogether free from one-sided views. While the Gnostic violently separated the internal from the external in religion, they were in danger of identifying and confounding the two; in opposition to the arbitrary allegorizing exegesis of the Gnostic, they were in danger of an exegesis of the letter merely; while opposing the abuse or misuse of speculation, they ran the hazard of rejecting philosophy and speculation altogether. In some instances, as in that of Papias in the middle of the 2d century, this tendency reached a very gross extreme, involving positive error.

Hence it was natural, and in many ways salutary, that along with this practical tendency still another sprang up, which sought to maintain a mean between a narrow and arbitrary speculation upon the one side, and an unscientific credence upon the other. Beginnings of this tendency had already appeared in the 2d century, in Justin Martyr, and, indeed, among the Apostolical Fathers themselves in Barnabas, but it found its fuller development in the *Alexandrine School*, which was founded principally by Pantaenus about the middle of the 2d century, was advanced still further by Clement at the end of the 2d and beginning of the 3d centuries, and reached its highest influence under the leadership of Origen towards the middle of the 3d century. This philosophizing tendency ultimately resulted in the construction of the scientific theology of the Christian church; but in the writings of the Alexandrine school especially (see § 59), it appears contracted and one-sided. This school, in its interpretation of Scripture, not only misapprehended the real relation between the letter and the spirit, and, instead of deducing the latter from the former, often imported a false meaning into the letter, but also not inconsiderably transformed and altered the creed of the church, by applying to it the ideas and conceptions of its own speculative system, as if they were the truths of the absolute reason.

Through the collision of both of these tendencies, and of all these one-sided efforts of individual minds, the dogmatic development of revealed truth took its straight-onward course, retaining all the elements of the Scripture representation, and combining them into an ever expanding system. In this process, while the Alexandrine-Hellenistic mind wrought upon the dogmatic material in the way of expansion and progress, the Occidental intellect, observative and conservative in its nature, imparted direction and proportion to the Oriental mobility, and prevented its otherwise lawless and falsifying action.

While the development of the essential substance of Christianity, in the first centuries, proceeded in and by these two main tendencies of the Ecclesiastical mind as represented by the leading church teachers, it was natural that single parts of the Christian system should be differently conceived and treated by different individual minds. This difference is plainly visible in regard to the doctrines of the Divine Attributes, Creation, Providence, the Trinity, Man, Christ, the Church and Sacraments, and Eschatology. Yet, owing to the external struggles of the church to maintain its very existence, together with the fact that these doctrinal differences between individual minds were not embodied in symbols as authoritative statements, these differing modes of conceiving Christian doctrine continued to exist side by side within the church, without producing division within it, while, at the same time, that bold and determined opposition to all heretical and anti-Christian views, which was waged by *all* Catholic minds, tended to harmonize even these differences, by a louder and clearer emphasis of the distinctive and essential doctrines of the gospel.

CHAPTER FIRST.

HERESIES AND SECTS.

§ 41.

CLASSIFICATION OF HERETICAL SECTS.

MEN of all kinds, the most diverse in culture, mind, and character, were attracted by the divine power of the new religion. Many of them, however, had not sufficient self-denial to renounce everything anti-Christian in sentiment and opinion. Their heart was divided more or less between Christ and the world, and they could not take the narrow way of earnest repentance and childlike faith. Hence their illumination, in respect at least to many fundamental points, was a merely human one, and the principle of their life, a selfish one. They deemed themselves to excel their contemporaries in the understanding of divine revelation; but the systems which they self-complacently constructed were falsifications of Christian doctrine, and the higher esoteric associations into which they segregated from the common fraternity of the church, and which the church steadfastly discountenanced, in the end became heretical sects. Of these there were four classes, during this first period: —

1. The *Judaistic*, who sought to fuse Christianity with a dead and formal pseudo-Judaism.

2. The *Oriental-Theosophic*, who strove to make over Christian truth into a philosophico-theosophic scheme, by combining the gospel with the Eastern theosophies.

3. The *Fanatic-Ascetical*, who would introduce a hyper-

spirituality, together with its accompaniments spiritual pride and unreasoning asceticism, into the Christian religion and church.

4. The *Rationalistic*, who sought to form and shape the system of revelation by the limited conceptions of an understanding narrowed and weakened by sin; this class were sometimes Judaizing, and sometimes Paganizing in their bent, according to the influences bearing upon them.

§ 42.

ARCH-HERETICS (SO-CALLED).

Ittig De Haeresiarchis aevi apostolici.

The long series of heretics is opened by some men of the time of the apostles, to whose tendencies more importance has sometimes been attached than is due to them. Some of the ancient fathers, for example, in their endeavors to exhibit a system of error running parallel with the evangelical system, and antagonistic to it, from the very first, have deemed it warrantable to designate by the name of "Arch-heretics" three men of the Apostles' time, of heretical tendencies indeed, but insignificant in their influence. These were: —

1. *Simon Magus*, of Gitton in Samaria,[1] according to his own pretence an incarnation of the creative mundane spirit, *ἡ δύναμις τοῦ ϑεοῦ ἡ μεγάλη,* Acts viii. 10. (accompanied by a female named Helena, — his first *ἔννοια,* — an incarnation of the recipient mundane-spirit), but in fact a juggler and pimp who strolled through Samaria, and was revered as divine by the multitude, an account of magic arts. The miracles and preaching of the deacon and evangelist Philip, in Samaria, drew the multitude away from Simon, and he himself was baptized (Acts viii. 9 seq.). But his proposition

---

[1] Respecting Simon Magus, see Justin Martyr Apol. I., § 26, 56, and Dial. c. Tryph. § 120. fin.

to the apostles, who imparted the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands, that they should for money bestow upon himself the power of doing the like,[1] drew upon him the rebuke of Peter, which, however, as well as his baptism, made no impression upon him. This encounter of Simon with the apostle Peter gave him an exaggerated importance in the eyes of the first Christians. He passed with them for the representative of fanatics and magicians, — the antagonists of the true preachers of the gospel, — and fictitious accounts of various kinds (for example of several formal disputations with Peter, according to the Clementines; also the fabulous story of his death by drowning, in a voyage undertaken in opposition to Peter, according to Sulpic. Sev. Hist. II. 28) became mixed with his history. Inasmuch as we know of no other Simon, it is very possible that Simon Magus may have given the first impulse towards the formation of the Gnosticising sect of *Simonians*, mentioned by Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. I. 23), and Clement of Alexandria (Strom. II. p. 383; VII. p. 165).

2. *Dositheus*, also of Samaria, the founder of a sect entirely disconnected from the Christians. His party, according to some accounts, regarded him as the Messiah promised in Deuteronomy xviii. 18. Though a very insignificant sect in the 3d century, it was in existence in the 6th. Dositheus himself, deserted by the people, died in a cavern from hunger, a fugitive, and an ascetic.[2]

3. *Menander*, likewise a Samaritan, a pretended pupil of Simon Magus, and of the same craft, who also claimed to be the Messiah and God-man.

---

[1] The selling and buying of spiritualities, after the 6th century, was denominated "Simony."

[2] Comp. Origen in Johan. Tom. XIV. p. 219.

Judaistic Sects.

Neander Church History, I. 341–365. Gieseler Ueber die Nazaräer und Ebioniten, in Städlin and Tzschirner's Archiv. Bd. IV. St. 2. Mosheim Commentaries, I. § 39–43. Schliemann Die Clementinen. Schwegler Nachapostolische Zeitalter.

§ 43.

EBIONITES, NAZARENES, AND ELCESAITES.

The convention of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem (Acts xv.) had unanimously decided that faith in Christ, alone, justifies and saves the soul, and had consequently not required of the Gentile-Christians the observance of the Jewish ceremonial law, while at the same time they allowed the Jewish-Christians their accustomed observance of it. Hence, in the first days of the church, in case it happened that churches composed wholly of Jewish-Christians wore an aspect in regard to externals strikingly different from those made up of Gentile-Christians, they were by no means looked upon as sectaries or schismatics. Only a small party among them bore, from the beginning, such a character; those, namely, who, not content with the liberty conceded of observing the Jewish ceremonial law, insisted that its observance was also binding upon all Christians. But in process of time, all Jewish-Christians who continued to cling to the observance of the ceremonial law acquired a certain sectarian bias and vein. The church at Jerusalem, in particular, by far the most important of the Jewish-Christian churches, naturally, from the very first, and even in its retreat at Pella during the Jewish war, harmonized in the observance of the ceremonial law. But after the fall of the holy city, many of them perceived the indications of the Divine hand, and when at length Hadrian issued his order forbidding the Jews to settle again either in the district of Jerusalem, or in the city of Aelia Capitolina built in its place, a portion of the Jerusalem church, recognizing and revering with increasing intelligence the Divine purpose, openly renounced the Jewish ceremonial law, mingled with their brethren of Gentile origin, and received a Gentile-Christian as their bishop. The consequence of this was, that those Palestine Christians who held the observance of the ceremonial law to be necessary, whether only for themselves relatively, or for the whole church absolutely, and who for this reason could not come into this change, from this time onward constituted a party separate from the Christian church under the name of *Ebionites;* or rather they constituted two parties (as Justin Martyr distinguishes them, though not by two different names, Dial. C. Tryph. § 47), — one, a stricter and positively heretical branch, which gradually acquired exclusively the name of *Ebionites;* the other, a more moderate and liberal, a more catholic and non-heretical branch, denominated *Nazarenes*, which, however, continued to grow and increase more and more in isolation from the general church.

The *Nazarenes*, (a name originally applied, according to Acts xxiv. 5, to all Christians among the Jews, and which is first found in Jerome, Comm. in Jesai., in this narrower application), did not assert the necessity of an observance of the ceremonial law by the Gentile-Christians, recognized Paul as the teacher of revealed truth for the heathen, and departed from the doctrine of the general church in no *essential* point. The *Ebionites*, on the contrary, (this name, also, in all probability was at first a general one for all Jewish-Christians, and became gradually limited to the separatists among them, in which stricter use it is found in Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Origen),[1] asserted the absolute obligation of all Christians to observe the ceremonial law, hereticated the Apostle Paul (Origen in Jerem. Hom. 18, § 12), and, holding the then current Jewish idea of the Messiah as a mere man endowed at his baptism with supernatural gifts, denied the existence of a divine nature in Christ.[1] Only once a year, on the feast of the passover, according to Epiphanius (Haer. XXX. 16), they partook, in remembrance of the last supper of Christ, of a sacrament with unleavened bread and water only.

---

[1] According to Tertullian's improbable statement, the sect was founded by an individual, Ebion by name, and called after him. Origen in Matt. c. 12 more correctly derives the name from אֶבְיוֹן though not because of their meagre religious belief, — since according to Epiphanius the Ebionites gave themselves the name, — but rather because of their outward poverty leading to a community of goods, or because claiming to have that poverty of spirit upon which Christ bestowed a blessing.

This seems to be the substance of all that can be relied upon with certainty, in the ancient accounts respecting this Judaizing party in the early church; the accounts themselves in regard to particular points are often discordant and vacillating,[2] and there is as yet no complete reconciliation and settlement of all the discrepancies. The recent assumption of the existence of a species of *Gnostic Ebionitism*, a Judaism absorbed in Gnostic elements, existing along with the common Jewish Ebionitism, seems to be supported upon historical grounds;[3] while, on the contrary, the theory of Baur and his school which reduces the whole of primitive Christianity to Ebionitism, out of which purer elements were not formed until the 2d century, rests upon arbitrary combinations, not to mention that the hypothesis of an improvement and purification of Christianity, in the 2d century, is as unproved as the assumed Ebionitism of everything previous.

A Judaizing-Gnostic sect, the *Elcesaites*, accorded with the Ebionites in rejecting the Apostle Paul. Origen (in Euseb. VI. 38) warns the church against their opinion that an outward denial of Christ is a matter of indifference, provided it be not an inward denial of the heart. Their name is derived from *Elxai*, a Jew of Trajan's time, whom Epiphanius (Haer. XIX. 1) mentions as one of the Essenes.

---

[1] Some of them, according to Origen, C. Cels. V. 61, denied the miraculous birth of Jesus; others affirmed it. Origen (in Matt. T. XI. 12) declares the whole sect to differ very little from the Jews.

[2] Justin. Martyr. Dial. c. Tryph.; Irenaeus Adv. Haer. I. 26, and elsewhere; Origen, in many places, e. g. in Matt. T. XVI. c. 12, in Jerem. Hom. 18, § 12, in Matt. T. XI. c. 12, C. Cels. V. 61; Epiphanius Haer. 30; the Clementines in many places, particularly Hom. 15, c. 7–9.

[3] By Schliemann: Die Clementinen, and Dorner: Person Christi. Th. I. Abth. 1, "Cerinthische Ebioniten."

Not much is known with certainty respecting the Gospel acknowledged by the Ebionites and Nazarenes. Probably this Judaizing division used as their Gospel a very much corrupted recension of the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, which is known under the name of the *Gospel of the Hebrews;* and this again in two different recensions, — the Gospel of the Nazarenes, and the Gospel of the Ebionites. The Gospel of the Hebrews is unfortunately lost, and even the accounts of the Hebrew Matthew are only the ancient though credible testimony of witnesses who themselves used only the Greek Matthew.

Oriental-Theosophic Sects.

THE GNOSTICS.

Original Sources: Irenaeus Adv. Haereses. Tertullian Contra Marcionem, De praescriptionibus haereticorum, Adv. Valentinianos, and Scorpiace contra Gnosticos. Epiphanius Contra haereses, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Origen, in scattered notices. Plotinus Ennead. II. lib. 9.

Compare: Neander Genetische Entwickelung der gnost. Systeme; Church History, I. 366–478. Dorner Person Christi, Th. I. Abth. 1, S. 324 seq., and 355 seq. Baur Die Christliche Gnosis (particularly pp. 122–414). Möhler Ueber den Ursprung des Gnosticismus. Matter Histoire crit du Gnosticisme. Lewald Comm. de doctrina gnostica. Mosheim Commentaries, I. § 41–65, § 70. Ritter Geschichte d. christl. Philosophie, I. 111. Burton Heresies of the Apostolic Age. Beausobre Histoire du Manichéisme, 2 T. 4.

§ 44.

NATURE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF GNOSTICISM.

1. The second class of heretical sects, the germs of which are also faintly visible in the time of the apostles, sought to convert the simple and practical gospel into a speculative philosophy of religion, by subordinating it to the Oriental-

theosophic systems, and subjecting it to their tests. Some of these sects were more moderate in comparison with others, while others were more bold and extreme; of the former were the Gnostics, of the latter the Manichaeans.

Γνῶσις, in the more general signification of the term, is a deeper insight into the nature and interior connections of religious truth. Such a *γνῶσις*, involving a profounder apprehension of all Christian doctrine, was one of the *χάρισματα* of the primitive church (1 Cor. xii. 8). From this, by a perversion, the Gnosis of the Gnostics took its name. As in all the ancient Oriental religions, the deeply corrupting distinction prevailed, between an esoteric doctrine for the priesthood and an exoteric one for the people, those Oriental theosophers, Jewish or Gentile as the case might be, who had nominally adopted Christianity, endeavored in the 2d century to force this distinction upon the Christian church. In this manner, an esoteric philosophy of religion was rankly and rapidly formed that was not only in rudest and most contemptuous opposition to the despised *πίστις* or *δόξα τῶν πολλῶν*, but was in its essential substance a total falsification of evangelical truth (Luke x. 21). This scheme was now designated by the name of *Γνῶσις*, by a more restricted application of a term used in the Alexandrine school, and previously in the apostolic age.

2. Gnosticism is of *twofold species;* according as it recognizes a connection between the Old and New Testaments, and regards the former as preparatory in some sort to the latter, thereby acknowledging to some extent the significance of Judaism; or, according as it recklessly tears the two asunder, and stands in only a purely polemic attitude towards the Old Testament.

The Gnostics of the first sort,—spiritual descendants of those teachers of false doctrine combatted by Paul in the first epistle to the Corinthians, still more plainly in Colossians, and plainest of all in his pastoral letters, and also by John in his epistles,—were most of them Jews originally. Jewish theological schools in Syria and Alexandria had for a long time endeavored, by means of an allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament, and the foisting in of spurious writings of patriarchs and prophets, to mix Judaism with the Oriental theosophy, particularly that of Zoroaster, and, at Alexandria especially, to connect it with the Platonic philosophy. Proceeding from the Oriental idea, that the knowledge of God, the eternal Being of beings, can be conveyed down only as a mystery among the educated few, while the masses, incapable of rising to this height of contemplation, can only worship the powers and spirits which flow forth from the Supreme as his manifestation, — such e. g. as the Divinities of the Pagan, and the Angel of the Jew, — these Jewish theosophers regarded the entire Jewish people as the people of God indeed, but considered themselves alone to be the *'Ισραὴλ νοητός* and *πνευματικός*, in distinction from the great multitude of the *'Ισραὴλ αἰσϑητός* and *σαρκικός*. Only among themselves, they supposed, had the knowledge of the concealed deity been diffused; the people on the contrary had been led by the Angel, the Demiurge, who, as the instrument of God, had produced the visible world, and who, unconsciously ruled by the ideas imparted to him by the absolute deity, was the representative of the Supreme, and by the mass of the people was mistaken for him. On passing over to Christianity, these Jewish theosophers modified their views as follows: through Christianity, the eternally perfect God, represented by the Demiurge and unknown to the world at large, and only dimly perceived by a few spiritual men, was for the first time revealed; and through Christianity, those eternal ideas by which the Demiurge was unconsciously directed were brought to light, and the true spiritual meaning of the hitherto misunderstood Jewish religion was displayed. These views were shared also by many Gentile speculatists on their renouncing paganism, and in this way arose a class of *Judaistic Gnostics* who recognized, more or less, the truth of the Old Testament.

Of a different aspect was the Gnosticism of such theosophers as had been pagans previous to their adoption of Christianity, — and pagans of a class who thoroughly despised

Judaism. These carried over their *contempt* for the Jewish religion, into their own narrow and erroneous apprehension of Christianity. They now violently rent the Judaism of the Old Testament out of all connection with the Christian religion, and separated themselves,—with regard to some individual points, though their essential principles and many of their conclusions were the same,—from the Judaistic Gnostic, so far as to regard the Demiurge, the revealer of Judaism, as being not simply a subordinate instrument of the Supreme deity, but a hostile enemy to him. In this manner arose, with many gradations, a class of *Anti-Judaistic Gnostics.*

3. That question, which from the first has most occupied the attention of the speculating mind,—whence is the world, and whence is evil,—was the problem of the Gnostic philosophy of religion. How does the finite come from the infinite? How can God be the author of a material universe? the holy and perfect God, the author of a world in which there is so much of defect and of sin? How comes the lofty and god-like spirit of man to be imprisoned in a hampering body, and within a world of limitation? These, and such like questions, the Gnostics attempted to answer; not, as did the Occidental mind, by logical reflection and in defined conceptions, but, as did the Oriental mind, by figurative notions, under which they set forth their ideas allegorically, and in which very often metaphor and conception were inseparably confounded with each other.

The Gnostic answer to these questions led to the enunciation of the two principal doctrines upon which Gnosticism rests: those of *Emanation* and *Dualism.* From an unfolding of the germs of life and perfection that are eternally inclosed in the one Supreme Being, all existence has gradually been formed in a connected chain,—like many flames from one light, like many numbers from the first unit, like thoughts and feelings from one soul,—the more perfect as it is nearer, and the more imperfect as it is more removed from, the primal centre and substance. This is the *doctrine of Emanation,* which appears in all the Oriental religions, and which is the direct contrary of the doctrine of *Creation from nothing*, — the latter regarding the origin of the Finite as an inexplicable miracle of divine omnipotence; the former sensuously explaining it as the mere shaping of a pre-existing material. But this still left the existence of evil unaccounted for; since the unholy could not spring from the holy, even in the most remote gradations and unfoldings, neither could the world of pure spirit, the higher intelligible realm, be transmuted into matter. Hence most of the Gnostics connected with the doctrine of Emanation, that of *Dualism*, or the assumption of an eternal principle of evil opposite to God. At this point, however, two different modes of conceiving the subject took their start, though each often touched the other at many mid-points, and both frequently run into each other in their minor and secondary branchings. These two methods appear in the *Syrian*, and the *Alexandrine* Gnostics; the first, Oriental and mythical in their bent, the last, Grecian and speculative. The Syrian Gnosticism, joining on upon the Old-Persian doctrine of Ormusd, the principle of good and of light, and Ahriman, the principle of evil and of darkness, held to the existence of an active and wildly-raging kingdom of evil or matter, which by its attack upon the kingdom of light has introduced into the system of things a mingling of light and darkness, of the Divine and the Undivine, and thereby, through the demiurgic working of the divine element which obtains in this mixture, has given existence to the lower visible world, which is thus a compound of light and matter. The Alexandrine Gnosticism, on the other hand, following the Platonic conception of the *Ὕλη*, saw in the Undivine merely something dead, unessential, inane, and only externally hindering the development of the divine life-germs, — an inert chaos, which in and of itself could make no positive assault upon the Divine; but inasmuch as the evolutions of the divine germs become weaker and fainter, in proportion as they are more distant from the first member of the series, the product at the outer verge of the kingdom of light comes out defective, and by reason of its inherent weakness sinks into chaos, or, according to another statement, the fulness of the divine life slightly spills over into chaos. Chaos now, for the first time, receives an animated life; by means of the Demiurge the visible sensible Creation is formed, but the Hyle now comes into active opposition to the Divine, and Satan, evil spirits, and hylic men[1] are its products.

4. Considering the character of this cosmogony of the Gnostics, in which the visible system of the universe presupposes a fall from the highest Deity, a disturbance of the harmony of being, it was to be expected that the *doctrine of Redemption* would by no means be lacking in their systems, but would rather hold an essential place. But while the Gnostics lost themselves in speculations and imaginations respecting the influence of Redemption upon the whole universe, its practical significance receded almost entirely into the back-ground, and the doctrine itself was drawn over from the moral and ethical province into the merely physical. The chief thing, in the eye of the Gnostic, was what the Redeeming Spirit had accomplished by his mere phenomenal *appearance*, while the significance of his redemptive *passion* was misapprehended or even vilified. In the Gnostic system, also, there was no true estimate of the example of the Redeemer as one for humanity. This was an inevitable consequence from the erroneous conception which the Gnostic entertained of the Person of Christ. As in his scheme the visible creation and its author were degraded far below the invisible world and the supreme God, so also in the Person of Christ the visible was torn asunder from the invisible, the human from the divine. The Gnostic readily acknowledged the manifested Godhead in Christ, but a true union of Deity and humanity in his person appeared to him to be an absurdity. Here, three minor Gnostic theories took

---

[1] The Gnostics generally held that one of three natures was peculiar to each man, and that he could not rise above it. Hence they divided mankind into three classes: Πνευματικοί, who long for the eternal and divine, and seek the γνῶσις; Ψυχικοί, who live a worldly life, yet without gross sin, and for whom πίστις is sufficient; Ὑλικοί, destitute of all moral feeling, who live in sensuality, and are ruled by matter and the principle of evil.

their start, sometimes sharply differing from each other, but sometimes also flowing into each other. Some (the *Docetae*, from δοκεῖν) beheld in the Redeemer merely a divine spirit, who had not actually appeared as a real man, but had assumed an apparently sensuous form in order that he might be perceived by men.[1] Others, on the other hand, held that the human in Christ was not a mere deceptive appearance; but they attributed to him a peculiar and unique humanity, — not a *σῶμα ὑλικόν*, but a *σῶμα ψυχικόν* or *πνευματικόν*. Lastly, a third class, adopting in part the current Jewish idea of the Messiah, beheld in Jesus a true and proper man, one like all other men, but did not regard him as the Redeemer strictly so called. They separated the divinity and humanity of Christ into two persons, by holding that from the time of his baptism to the time of his passion, a Genius of a high order, *ὁ ἄνω Χριστός*, sent from the Supreme Deity, had been united with the man Jesus, who employed the man Jesus, *τὸν κάτω Χριστόν*, merely as his instrument, and that this higher Genius alone was the Redeemer strictly so called.

5. So far as concerns the *ethics of the Gnostics:* as they departed essentially from the spirit of the Gospel in faith, so also did they in life and practice. And yet they were not wanting in a certain species of moral earnestness. From their doctrine of matter, as the principle of evil, a strict asceticism very naturally flowed. Yet we find instances among them in which, from this same dualistic principle, an entirely different tendency proceeded, — such a contempt of the material world as led to the maxim, that to the wise man the earthly, in all its forms, is a matter of total indifference, and that the wise man should be able to surrender himself to sensuous lusts without thereby disturbing in the least the tranquillity of his contemplation.

The ethical maxims of those Gnostic sects who did not, as did the majority, connect dualism with the doctrine of emanation, but who united *Pantheism* with it, were especially corrupting. The incomprehensible divine primal essence, they held, is the only thing that really exists. From this, all being flows forth, and into this all returns. All individual definitude, all personality, is limitation, a merely transient form, and of no significance for the wise man, who stands at the highest point of view. He, consequently, is lifted above the laws of morality, as well as above all laws. For him, entity and non-entity, good and evil, asceticism and voluptuousness, are identical, and he must prove his perfection by absorption in contemplation in the midst of all excesses. It is no wonder that even the pagan Porphyry (De abstinenta I. 40) lashes the horrible debaucheries of such Christians.

---

[1] This view Ignatius opposes, — upon the foundation laid in the Logos-doctrine of the apostle John, — in his Epistles (Ad Ephes. c. 7, 18; Ad Smyr. c. 1–8). See Niemeyer De Docetis.

6. The *number* of the Gnostics, and the extent of their influence, cannot now be accurately determined. Yet, owing to the general intellectual activity of the time,[1] Gnostics appear almost everywhere in Christendom, though it is rare to find that the Gnostic club is superior in numbers and strength to the local church. The 2d century was the blooming period of Gnosticism; it has lost its energy in the 3d century, is prostrate in the 4th, and almost wholly disappears in the 6th.

---

[1] "In Gnosticism, —says Dorner,—we see the awakening, on a vast scale, of an intellectual interest in Christianity as a system of *truth*, and the heretofore sluggish development of Christian science received, indirectly, from it, an impulse that lasted for centuries. If we except the present time, never has there been such a powerful hankering for pure cognition, in Christendom, as existed then." This desire for knowledge however was unaccompanied by moral and spiritual cravings. The Gnostic sought to know Christianity as truth merely, and not as *life.*

Judaistic Gnostics.

§ 45.

CERINTHUS.

The series of Gnostics, at first few and far between, is opened by *Cerinthus*, of Asia Minor, a contemporary and fellow-inhabitant of the Apostle John in his old age (comp. § 17). This heretic was inclined, with the Ebionite, to identify Christianity and Pseudo-Judaism, — including in this latter the Jewish chiliastic views; and also, with the Gnostic, to effect the combination of the two systems in a highly speculative method, and in a way that degraded the personality of Christ. This double tendency in Cerinthus best reconciles the conflicting accounts respecting him; for Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. I. 26, describes him as a Gnostic, holding a system entirely similar to the later Gnostic systems; Epiphanius, on the contrary, Haer. 8 (or 28), represents him as a defender of the absolute necessity of observing the ceremonial law; and Caius of Rome, and Dionysius of Alexandria, in Euseb. III. 28, describe him as a gross Chiliast.[1]

According to Irenaeus, Cerinthus held that the visible world was not produced immediately by the supreme and perfect Deity, but by a subordinate spirit, the Demiurge, a servant-angel, through whom also the law had been given; that the absolute God was unknown to the world until he was revealed through the Christian religion, the only immediate revelation of the supreme Deity; that the true Messiah was not the man Jesus, but the highest of the heavenly Genii, the divine Logos, who was connected with the man Jesus at his baptism, and wrought in him up to the time of his passion. With this Gnostic theory, Cerinthus, inasmuch as his Ebionitism was of the more refined species as his Christology shows, would be able to connect, as Epiphanius asserts he did, the Old-Testament ceremonial-religion as a symbolic vesture for his Gnosis. He could do this the more easily, since, also according to Epiphanius, he did not insist upon the observance of the whole ceremonial law, but, as did many mystic Jewish sects, of only a part of it. Furthermore, the statement of Caius and Dionysius that Cerinthus expected a millennial Messianic reign at the end of the ages is the more readily reconcilable with his Gnosticism, when we remember that Caius and Dionysius were the most vehement opposers of Chiliasm, and have probably represented the views of Cerinthus as being more gross than they really were. According to Epiphanius, Cerinthus denied the resurrection of Christ, and expected this event at the beginning of the millennial reign; a statement which, though not very well authenticated, would agree well with the Christology of Cerinthus, according to which the divine Logos may have deserted the man Jesus at the time of his passion, in order to a re-union with him at the time when he should be raised from the dead, to establish his kingdom of glory upon the earth.

---

[1] See Dorner Person Christi, p. 310 seq. Also Schmidt Cerinthus ein judaisirender Christ; Paulus Historia Cerinthi, in his Introduc. in N. T.

§ 46.

BASILIDES.

Basilides, of Syria according to Epiphanius, lived about the year 125 in Alexandria, and there founded a Gnostic school, which his son *Isidorus* continued after him.

His system is founded upon the doctrine of Emanation, as shaped by the sacred number seven and the sacred number of the days in the year, combined with the doctrine of Dualism. In order to the production of anything finite, the powers and perfections which lie undeveloped in the incomprehensible concealed first essence (ὁ ϑεὸς *ἀκατονόμαστος*) must first come forth as individual self-subsistences. These seven (according to the number of the days of the week, of the planets, etc., Comp. Rev. i. 4), divine powers, — four intellectual: *νοῦς*, the *λόγος* which reveals it, the reflective power *φρόνησις*, and *σοφία*; then, might *δύναμις*, moral perfection *δικαιοσύνη*, and inward peace *εἰρήνη*, — constitute the middle member between the unsearchable being of God and the creation developed from him, and, in combination with the original divine unit unfolded in and by them, make up the *πρώτη ὀγδοάς* the Octave, or ground of all existence. From these seven *δυνάμεις* the whole world of spirits emanates, by gradations of sevens, each lower group being the inferior image of the higher. Three hundred and sixty-five of these septads run themselves off, growing gradually feebler, and closing with the lowest class of spirits. This number 365 is contained in the mystic watch-word of the Basilideans, *ἀβράξας* or *αβρασάξ*, formed after the Greek mode of reckoning numbers by the alphabet. From a mingling of the kingdom of darkness or of the *ὕλη*, — probably, according to Basilides, through a positive attack, — with some parts of this spirit-kingdom, and the consequent mixture of light and darkness, of life and death, of mind and matter, there arose, — under the particular influence of the first of the seven spirits in the last of the 365 gradations, who was called *ὁ ἄρχων*, — the visible world, in which now, from the stone the lowest species of existence, up to man the highest, a soul chained by matter was continually striving to set itself free. Over this earthly world, the Archon presided. He also was the special leader of the Jewish people, and was unconsciously guided, in the construction of the Jewish religion as in the construction of the world, by the ideas of the supreme Deity, which ideas were first revealed in Christianity. The Archon conducts the whole process of purifying the inferior fallen spirits through the transmigration of souls; but the highest and ultimate aim, — the bringing back of those loftier natures of the kingdom of light, who stood above him, to their original communion with the absolute God, — was beyond the reach of the limited powers of this lower Archon. Hence the supreme Deity himself enters into the course of the world as a Redeemer, and Christianity appears. With the highly-gifted man Jesus, who was the Messiah promised and sent by the Archon, the *νοῦς* was united at the baptism in Jordan, in order to the restoration of harmony in the universe. The *νοῦς* now works through the man Jesus up to the time of the Passion, which the man then endured alone; for, like all human suffering, it was the atonement which he owed for personal guilt incurred in an antecedent life. The *νοῦς*, through Jesus as his organ, reveals for the first time the concealed Deity, restores the higher fallen spirits to communion with the kingdom of light, and imparts to them the divine life of this kingdom. Entrance into the kingdom thus established by the Redeemer, by a surrendry to it of the mind in reflection, is faith. The Archon himself, through the appearing of the *νοῦς*, comes to a conscious knowledge of this higher ordonnance of the universe, and subjects himself to it. The final end of the whole plan is the universal victory of the kingdom of light, the extinction by fire of all the evil diffused in matter, and the sole continuance of the kingdom of light in its manifold gradations.

The ruling principle in the *ethics* of Basilides was, that man should purify himself more and more from the evil foreign to him, and attain to the free development of his spiritual nature (Comp. Alex. Strom. II. p. 409; III. p. 427. Ed. Sylb. Col.).

A sect of *Basilideans* existed far into the 4th century; but those "Basilideans" whom Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. I. 24) describes as men who, under pretence that the perfectly holy are free from all law, gave themselves up to lusts of all sorts, are to be regarded (according to Clem. Alex. Strom. III. in initio) as false adherents of Basilides, *Pseudo-Basilideans*, who did not harmonize with him even in their theoretical principles, but were Anti-Judaistic Gnostics and Docetae. They gradually destroyed the historical connection,—assumed by Basilides,—between Christianity and the Old Testament, by asserting the apostasy of the god of the Jews, regarded the life of Jesus as a mere scenic phenomenon, and, in their elevation above all positive religions, held it to be a matter of indifference to deny one who had suffered only a seeming crucifixion, and to sacrifice to idols.

§ 47.

VALENTINUS AND HIS SCHOOL.

Valentinus, a native of Egypt, who came from Alexandria to Rome about 140, and died either there or at Cyprus, has left a peculiarly constructed system, the most ingenious and fanciful of all the Gnostic schemes, founded upon the doctrine of the sexual distinction as the condition of all development of life, and upon Platonic ideas.

According to the Valentinian Gnosticism, there emanate from the highest original Being, denominated *Βυϑός* or *Αἰών*, the divine energies (*δυνάμεις*) denominated *αἰῶνες*, who are the revealers and representatives of the original unfathomable Æon or Abyss. Since one and the same law of sex pervades all grades of being, the evolving process brings out from the bottomless Abyss masculine and feminine aeons, in pairs, the male complementary to the female, through whose connection and inworking the chain of life unfolds. Of such pairs (*συζυγίαι*), Valentinus assumed fifteen, making in all thirty aeons, who constitute an octave (*ὀγδοάς*), a decade (*δεκάς*), and a do-decade (*δωδεκάς*). The first circle, of eight, is composed as follows: First, the primal *Βυϑός*, and *σιγή* or *ἔννοια*, his self-consciousness; from these emanate *νοῦς* or *μονογενής*, and *ἀλήϑεια*; then, from these emanate *λόγος*, and *ζωή*; and, lastly, from these emanate *ἄνϑρωπος*, the archetype of man, and *ἐκκλησια*, the archetype of the church. The second circle, of ten, is formed in a similar manner by emanations from *λόγος* and *ζωή*. The third circle, of twelve aeons, flows in like manner from *ἄνϑρωπος* and *ἐκκλησια*. But as all existence has its ground in the self-limitation of the Bythos, the existence of all creaturely existences rests also upon limitation, and hence the Æon Horus (*ὅρος*), —

the begetter of Bythos himself considered as one of the syzygies, and who stands on the verge of the Aeonian kingdom, but does not belong to it,—plays an important part in the system of Valentinus. The whole world of aeons Valentinus denominates *τὸ πλήρωμα,* the fulness of the divine Being, in distinction from Chaos, *τὸ κενόν* or *κένωμα* the void, *ἡ ὕλη* or the kingdom of matter and evil. All development of life in its lower forms proceeds from a mingling of the divine life-germs with dead matter; the former sinking down from the Pleroma into the Kenoma. These life-germs, by which life was first imparted to the Hyle, were contained in *σοφία* or *ψυχὴ τῶν πάντων,* the lowest of the feminine aeons which yet was exalted high above all contact with the Hyle. From the almost violently passionate striving of this aeon to unite itself with the Bythos and to explore its abyss of being, a disharmony arose within the Pleroma, and the result was a defective, immature product, a feeble, inadequate image of the heavenly Wisdom,—the inferior World-soul, *ἡ κάτω σοφία, ἐνθύμησις* or *'Αχαμώθ* (i. e. חָכְמוֹת). This sinks down from the Pleroma, wanders about upon the outside of it, imparts germs of life to matter, and forms the Demiurge, who now creates the visible world. In the visible world, consequently, there is only an imperfect and diseased manifestation of the divine Wisdom. But it is not always to remain such. The revelation of the divine Wisdom in the world will ultimately reach perfection, and the lower mundane-soul will at length reach the point at which it will be a complete image of the higher. This is to take place through the introduction of Christianity into the world.

In the visible world substances of three kinds are mingled: 1. The *πνευματικόν,* and the *πνευματικοί* kindred to the divine World-soul; 2. The *ψυχικόν,* and the *ψυχικοί* who possess a moral nature but are not capable of the pure apprehension of the Divine,—at the head of whom stands the Demiurge, the special leader of the Jews, who follows blindly and unconsciously (until redemption is complete) the ideas of the Supreme Deity; 3. The *ὑλικον,* and the *ὑλικοί* who spring from the ungodly Hyle,—at whose head stands Satan, the first product of the wild force of the Hyle enlivened by the spark of divine life. The aim now is, to separate the *πνευματικόν* and *ψυχικόν* in the world, from the *ὑλικόν,* to conduct the first back into the Pleroma, and the second into an intermediate place which is the present residence of the Achamoth. In order to attain this end, and restore harmony in the Pleroma so that the divine Wisdom may obtain a perfect manifestation in the visible world, two new aeons, the 16th pair, arise, viz.: *χριστός* and *τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον,* and then there emanates from all the aeons collectively the aeon *ἰησοῦς* or *σωτήρ,* who, as the future *σύζυγος* of the Achamoth, is to conduct back both the Achamoth and the pneumatic natures, by means of the Gnosis, into the Pleroma, when the lower World-soul will be a complete image of the higher. This redeeming Genius, the *σωτήρ,* united himself, at the baptism in Jordan, with a psychical Messiah promised and sent by the Demiurge. The function of this Saviour is to liberate the *ψυχικοί,* who are incapable of an entrance into the Pleroma, from the power of the Hyle, and to conduct them, by means of *πίστις,* to a happiness suited to their nature. For this reason the *σωτήρ* cannot unite himself with a hylic body, but only with a *σῶμα ψυχικόν,* — a body entirely resembling the human, but formed of ethereal material. This body, the Messiah receives from the Demiurge, and this union of the Soter with it lasts until the Passion of the psychical Messiah, and constitutes the substance of the work of redemption. At last the psychical Messiah is raised up to the level of the Demiurge, who now gives him the government in his name, and the pneumatic natures are raised up into Pleroma, being followed by all spiritual natures who are redeemed.

The Valentinians, the most influential and important division of the Gnostics, continued to exist, under various modifications of their system, till into the 4th century, and later; their principal seat being the city of Rome. The four following Gnostics, all of them of the 2d century, are the most distinguished of the Valentinian school.

1. *Heracleon* at Alexandria, the author of the first com-

mentary upon the Gospel of John, fragments of which are preserved in Origen's Commentary; a man, with all his errors, of devout and serious character.

2. *Ptolomaeus*, who, in his Epistola ad Floram (Epiphan. Haer. XXVIII. 3), has exhibited the Valentinian views of the relation of the Old to the New Testament.

3. *Marcus* of Palestine, in the West in the second half of the 2d century, who clothed the Valentinian principles in a symbolism borrowed from the Jewish Cabbalists.

4. *Bardesanes* (in Syrian Bardaison, in Arabic writers called Ibn Daisan or simply Daisan), flourished about 170 at Edessa. He was distinguished for his learning, and was likewise famous for the musical form which he imparted to the Syriac language. In connection with his son *Harmonius*, he composed Syriac hymns which were still in use in the 4th century.[1] Bardesanes busied himself with astrology, and a fragment of his treatise περὶ εἱμαρμένης (on starry influence), is extant in Euseb. Praep. Ev. VI. 10. According to Eusebius, Bardesanes was first a follower of Valentinus, but afterwards came over to the Catholic church, still retaining some of his Valentinian doctrines. Epiphanius states the reverse of this. According to Ephraim Syrus, whose statement is the most probable, Bardesanes was always a Valentinian, but a moderate one, who could easily accommodate himself to the church as to the ψυχικοί. His sect (in Arabic El-Daisanije) existed for some centuries.

[1] Hahn Bardesanes Gnosticus, Syrorum primus hymnologus.

Anti-Judaistic Gnostics.

§ 48.

OPHITES.

Mosheim Ketzergeschichte (Geschichte der Schlangenbrüder).

The sect of *Ophites* arose in Egypt, perhaps before that of Valentinus, to whose system theirs is similar in many respects, though less fanciful, and decidedly Anti-Judaistic. Much obscurity overhangs their origin, and many (Comp. Origines C. Cels. VI. c. 28) would trace their beginnings to an Ante-Christian period; a supposition favored by the fact that the serpent, which was their symbol, was a very ancient emblem and peculiar to Egypt. They derived their name from the serpent, which they venerated as the sacred symbol of the mundane-soul. They also regarded the fall of man as the beginning of true conscious wisdom for humanity, and for this reason venerated the serpent of the Temptation.

According to the Ophites, there emanate from the Bythos: the *πρῶτος ἄνϑρωπος*, or the ideal man; the *δεύτερος ἄνϑρωπος*, or the actual man, also denominated the *υἱὸς ἀνϑρώπου*; and the *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*. This last, as the mother of all life, espouses the two first, and brings forth *χριστός* a perfect masculine light-nature, and *σοφία* an imperfect female one who is the pervading soul of the world. This *σοφία*, in seeking to be as God, fell into the Abyss and bore a son. This son is the Demiurge, *'Ιαλδαβαώϑ* (Heb., son of Chaos), the first of the seven planet-princes, a being hostile to the Supreme Deity, and the author of Judaism which is in direct opposition to Christianity. The *'Οφιόμορφος*, an image of the Jaldabaoth when he looked down full of hatred and envy into the Hyle and saw his own reflection, is the ruler of the Hyle and the author of all evil. Yet, both Ophiomorphos and Jaldabaoth are compelled without their knowledge and will to serve the designs of the Sophia. The six angels of Jaldabaoth, at his selfish command, create man as their image, — an immense corporeal mass without a soul. Jaldabaoth imparts to man a living spirit, but is thereby, at first without knowing it, himself despoiled of the higher principle of life by the will of the Sophia. Man is now upon the point of raising himself above the Jaldabaoth, who now strives with all his might to hold him in the state of unconscious bondage by a command (Gen. iii.). According to one view of the Ophite system, the Sophia moves man to disobey through the instrumentality of the Ophiomorphos, the serpentine spirit. According to another view, the Sophia himself, under the form of a serpent, opens the eyes of man from whom the knowledge of good and evil is withheld by the envious and narrow-minded Jaldabaoth, so that man by this knowledge may raise himself above him. As a punishment, Jaldabaoth banishes men from the ethereal regions into the dark earth, and into dark bodies, where, on the one side, Jaldabaoth and his angels strive to suppress the higher consciousness within them, and, on the other side, the evil spirits of Hyle seek to tempt them to sin and idol worship, and to subject them to the punishment of the strict Jaldabaoth. Man is continually strengthened by the *σοφία,* but he struggles in vain to release himself entirely from his bonds. At length the Supreme Deity himself brings about the complete redemption of man, together with the restoration of the Sophia also into the Pleroma. Jaldabaoth sends to man the psychical Messiah, Jesus, and the Supreme God sends the pneumatical Messiah, Christ, who unites himself with the former at the baptism in Jordan. But since, after this union, Jesus overthrows Judaism and thereby opposes instead of promoting the kingdom of Jaldabaoth, the god of the Jews permits him to be crucified. At last Jesus is raised by Christ to heaven, where he attracts and receives into himself all spirits who have by his redemption been released and purified from their earthly natures. The god of the Jews, on the contrary, sinks into the inane abyss of matter, being by degrees entirely deprived of all his spiritual powers.

The Ophites represented the principal doctrines of their system in a symbolical figure denominated the *διάγραμμα*. They continued to exist as a sect until the middle of the 6th century.

Closely allied to the Ophites were: —

1. The *Sethians*, named from Seth the son of Adam, to whom the Sophia imparted the seed of a higher spiritual life, in order to the conquest of the hylic principle in man, and who at last again appeared in the person of the Messiah. According to the Sethian theory, two human pairs were created; the one, the *ὑλικοί* from whom Cain was born, was made by the angel of darkness, the other, the *ψυχικοί* from whom Abel was born, was created by the angel of the Demiurge. In the place of Abel, the Sophia caused Seth to be born.

2. The *Cainites*, named from Cain, whom they particularly reverenced, as they did all the evil personages portrayed in the Old Testament, regarding them as the sons of Sophia and the enemies of the Demiurge, — in this way carrying the Ophite hostility to the Old Testament to a still intenser degree. The Cainites required of the neophyte that he should curse the name of Jesus, as that of the psychical Messiah. They held all the apostles to be narrow-minded men, with the exception of Judas Iscariot, who, through the higher Gnosis which he possessed, brought about the death of Jesus and thus destroyed the kingdom of the Demiurge.

§ 49.

SATURNINUS.

Saturninus at Antioch in Syria (about 125), a contemporary of Basilides, developed a system kindred to the Basilidean, yet less fanciful, moderately Anti-Judaistic, docetic, and strictly ascetic. From the original Being, the *πατὴρ ἄγνωστος*, the world of spirits unfolds in gradations. In the last grade, on the line between the kingdom of light and the wildly-raging kingdom of the evil principle *σατανᾶς*, stand seven spirits, fallen indeed from the unknown Father, yet contending against the kingdom of Satan. Their chief is the god of the Jews. These seven inferior spirits, who animate the planets, and from whom, either with or against their will, the whole sensuous world proceeds, (*ἄγγελοι κοσμοκράτορες*), are separated from the kingdom of light, and only a faint mock-gleam shimmers down upon them from the far distance, or in their own recollection only. In order to obtain this ray and keep it in their own kingdom, they form man after its image. But the work of their feeble hands is too weak for the conflict with evil, and is unable even to erect itself. The supreme Deity now takes compassion upon this creature made in the image of those dwelling in his own kingdom of light, and pours into the nature of man a portion of his own divine life, which now constitutes in man the *πνευματικόν,* or god-like principle. To this race of men, Satan now sets in opposition another race of men who carry within themselves only the hylic principle. In order, now, to liberate the pneumatic men from the dominion of the Hyle and Satan, as well from that of the god of the Jews and the other planetary spirits, and to raise them to the realm of light, and destroy both of the hostile kingdoms, the supreme God sends down to earth his highest Genius, the *νοῦς,* as a Redeemer, who manifests himself in a sensuous form that is such only in appearance, since the *νοῦς* cannot enter into connection with the starry kingdom or the material world. In order to keep from all contact with the evil principle, the Saturninians refrained from marriage and the eating of flesh. The sect disappears in the 2d century, being probably absorbed in the Marcionite Gnostics.

§ 50.

TATIAN, AND THE ENCRATITES.

To the Gnostics, and in all probability to the Anti-Judaistic division of them, belonged the *Encratites* (*Ἐγκρατῖται*),—so denominated from their strict abstinence, particularly from marriage as a work of the Evil Spirit. They were also called *Hydroparastates*, because they held the use of wine to be sinful, and hence celebrated the sacrament of the Supper with water only. The head of at least an important party in this sect of Encratites, which continued to exist beyond the 4th century, was *Tatian* of Assyria, born about 174, first a rhetorician at Rome, and afterwards a member of the Catholic church, having been converted to Christianity by the teaching of Justin Martyr. While a member of the church, he seems to have composed his *Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας* (§ 29), and his Harmony of the Four Gospels, *Εὐαγγέλιον διὰ τεσσάρων*. After the death of Justin, Tatian apostatized from the church and became a dualistic Gnostic, moderately Anti-Judaistic, and distinguished for his strictly ascetic ethics. In his work "respecting Christian perfection after the model of Christ" (*Περὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν σωτῆρα καταρτισμοῦ*), he represents Christ as the ascetic ideal. According to Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. I. 28), Tatian held an Aeon-doctrine resembling that of Valentinus; and, according to Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. III. p. 460), he asserted a contrariety between the Old and New Testaments, as also between the old and new man. His strict asceticism would lead to the inference, that he held to a hostile relationship between the world of the Demiurge and the higher realm of light; nevertheless he does not seem to have rudely arrayed the one against the other, for, in his explanation of Gen. i. 3, he represents the Demiurge sitting in darkness as praying to the Supreme Deity for light.[1]

---

[1] Origen De orat. c. 24; Theodotus Didascal. anatol. p. 806.

Of that party of the Encratites which stood in immediate connection with Tatian, the most distinguished were *Julius Cassianus*, a Docete, in the 2d century, and *Severus*, about 200, from whom a particular portion of the Encratites who rejected all the Epistles of Paul, probably because they are anti-ascetic, were called *Severians.*

§ 51.

ECLECTIC-ANTINOMIAN GNOSTICS.

An exact contrary to the Encratites is seen in those Anti-Judaistic Gnostics who opposed not only Judaism and the Old Testament but the whole moral law also, as the enslaving work of the Demiurge, and were noted for their libertine principles and unbridled licentiousness. To them belonged: —

1. The *Carpocratians;* a small sect which, however, continued to exist into the 6th century. It was founded in the first half of the 2d century, at Alexandria, by *Carpocrates*, and his son *Epiphanes*, — a youth of talent who died in his seventeenth year, and was revered with divine honors in Cephallenia by the multitude. The Carpocratians were noted for their bold contempt of the moral law. Their Gnosis consisted in the knowledge of one supreme Arch-Being, the highest unity (μονάς), from whom all existence flows forth, and into whom it all strives to return. All nature, they said in their pantheistic scheme, manifests a striving after union and communion. The moral law, and the popular religions generally, they held to be hostile to this communion. The Demiurges (ἄγγελοι κοσμοποιοί), — the finite spirits of earth, the instruments of the law and of all narrow popular religions, — seek to counteract this striving for communion, and, by constantly transferring into new bodies those souls which have sunk down into the material world and yet are kindred to the highest deity, to

keep them under their dominion. But the noblest of these souls, in the reminiscence of their former high estate, raise themselves above the popular religion, and above the moral law. Such were those sages among all nations, who, rising above their popular religions, sought to set men free from the Demiurge, and to unite them with the Supreme Deity. Such were Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle, and Jesus; the last especially, for, strengthened by his connection with the Monad, he had overthrown the religion of the god of the Jews and his law. The Carpocratians placed the busts and pictures of all these sages beside each other, in their temple in Cephallene consecrated to Epiphanes, and in their other sanctuaries. In the Carpocratian scheme, the external conduct is of no importance; only faith and love are to be insisted upon. He who, here below, shows his contempt for the Demiurges by a passionless lust, thereby elevates himself after death to a perfect unity with the Arch-Pure (Irenaeus Adv. Haer. I. 25).

2. The *Antitactes;* so named from their principle that it is a duty to oppose the god of the Jews, or the Demiurge.

3. The *Prodicians*, the adherents of a certain Prodicus; they claimed to be the sons of the highest Deity, and, consequently, were amenable to no law (Clem. Alex. Strom. I. p. 304; III. p. 438; III. p. 722).

4. The *Pseudo-Basilideans;* (See § 46).

5. The *Nicolaitans;* a sect of the 2d century, distinctly mentioned by Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. I. 26; III. 11), and Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. II. p. 411, Ed. Sylb. Col.; III. 436). They were Gnostics, Anti-Judaistic, and antinomian, whose distinctive principle was, that participation in the sacrificial feasts of the heathen, and the accompanying debaucheries, was a matter of indifference; nay that man must overcome lusts by giving himself up to them without being affected by them, and must show his contempt of the flesh by abusing it, and thereby extinguishing it. Irenaeus derives this sect from the Nicolaitans mentioned in Rev. ii. 6, 14, 15,—and perhaps not incorrectly; for although the name Nicolaitans in the Apocalypse is probably a symbolical one

for a *class* of errorists, yet it is not improbable that this later Anti-Jewish Gnostic sect designedly assumed this name, since it would appear to them to be an honor to have been opposed by the "Judaizing" John. The same remark will apply to the derivation, given by Irenaeus, of their name from the deacon Nicolaus of the church at Jerusalem (Acts vi. 5). This name being a favorite authority with the sects of that time, may have been chosen by this sect as that of their founder, upon the strength of an old motto (See Clem. Strom. II. p. 411) falsely ascribed to the deacon Nicolaus, in which a licentious contempt for the flesh is recommended.

§ 52.

MARCION, AND HIS SCHOOL.[1]

Marcion, towards the middle of the 2d century, is the representative of an Anti-Judaistic Gnosticism of a peculiar species. Making use to some extent of the general creed of the church, but strongly sympathizing with the Gentile-Christian tendency, as Ebionitism did with the Jewish-Christian, the Marcionite scheme stands somewhat between the predominantly speculative tendency of Gnosticism, and that predominantly practical Ebionite tendency which was opposed to it. Its author was the son of a bishop of Sinope in Pontus. Having, according to tradition, been excommunicated by his father, on account, probably, of his contempt of ecclesiastical authority and apostolical tradition, he betook himself to Rome, joined himself as an adherent to *Cerdo* a Gnostic who had come hither from Syria, and now moulded the principles which he had already cherished before this into a connected system.

Without opposing πίστις and γνῶσις to each other, Marcion sought, — partly from a really practical feeling, and partly from what he claimed was a genuinely Pauline spirit, — to evince an intrinsic contradiction between the enlivening and liberating spirit of the New Testament, and the minatory deadening law of the Old; in which endeavor he shamefully misapprehended the substance and significance of the New Testament itself. Involved in such subjective and arbitrary views of the nature of Christianity, he could not understand the Old Testament, failed to perceive the connection between Judaism and Christianity, saw in both religions only irreconcilable contraries, and declared the god of the Old Testament to be a restricted divinity, and entirely different from the perfect God of the New Testament. Marcion, in his Gnostic system, assumed three principles (ἀρχαι): the highest of these was the perfect holy and compassionate God, who had revealed himself in Christ (ϑεὸς ἀγαϑός, the "dear God" of sentimentalism, without punitive justice, and therefore without true holiness); opposed to him was the ὕλη, the principle of evil, with its ruler ὁ πονηρός, ὁ διάβολος; and midway between both was the Demiurge (δεμιουργὸς δίκαιος), who formed the world out of the Hyle, but was unable to overcome its evil, who was mighty but not almighty, and who rewards and punishes, indeed, in accordance with law, but does not pardon and redeem. Until the appearance of Christ the highest Deity was unknown; neither nature, nor the limited human reason, nor the Old Testament, could conduct mankind to God, who for the first time manifests himself in Christ. Up to this point, only the finite and limited Demiurge had been known among men. He chose a people to be led by himself, namely the Jews, and gave them a law which commands goodness and urges up to it by rewards and punishments, but which imparts no inward power in order to a holy life. To this his people, the Demiurge promised a Messiah, in order to liberate those of them who were faithful to the law from foreign domination, to give them earthly enjoyment, and to inflict a severe judgment upon the heathen. But the supreme Deity had compassion upon the heathen thus destined to destruction by the Demiurge, and sent a Redeemer to their aid, who pretends to be the Messiah promised by the Demiurge. Incapable of connecting himself with matter, the seat of evil, he comes in a *seeming* bodily form. The gospel of this Redeemer proclaims the forgiveness of sins, and imparts to all who believe the power of a divine life, whereby they can overcome evil. These believers are to be made blessed in the heavenly kingdom of the Redeemer, while unbelievers are left to the punitive justice of the Demiurge. Believers must, however, lead a heavenly life even while upon earth, — a strictly ascetic life removed from all contamination from matter, — and whoever was not capable of so doing must remain in the class of Catechumens.

---

[1] Hahn De gnosi Marcionis antinomi.

Of the New Testament, Marcion received only ten Pauline Epistles, and one of the Gospels. Pretending to be a genuine Paulinist, and being, unlike the Gnostics generally, a friend to the literal rather than allegorical interpretation of Scripture, he rejected the Pastoral Epistles of Paul, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, as a Judaizing addition to the Pauline writings. The Gospel which he received was a mutilated form of Luke's Gospel.[1]

According to Tertullian (De praescriptt. c. 30), Marcion, after wasting his energies in the endeavor to establish an independent church upon his own basis, at length manifested repentance, and asked to be received into church communion; but his death prevented.

The Marcionite party continued to exist till into the 6th century, much abominated, and split internally into many sections, owing to the various and unsuccessful attempts to complete the imperfect and indefinite Gnostic schemes, and to the mingling of Gnostics of various schools with the Marcionites.[2] Prominent among them was *Apelles*, in the 2d century, who at first adhered to the entire Marcionite system, but afterwards, on going to Alexandria, adopted the octrines of the Alexandrine Gnostics. In his old age, according to Eusebius (V. 13), he mournfully remarked that he had lost himself in speculations from which he could find no exit.

---

[1] Hahn Das Evangelium Marcions. Becker Examen critique de l' evangile de Marcion. Thilo Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti.

[2] Among the ancient polemic works against Marcion and his party, the most important are: Tertullian Adv. Marcionem; and the Dialogus De recta fide s. contra Marcionitas in Origen's works. — ascribed to him, but in reality a work of the 4th century. A modern school, represented by Gfrörer (Kirchengeschichte), sees in Marcion the reformer of Christianity in the 2d century.

§ 53.

HERMOGENES.

Boehmer Hermogenes Africanus.

Hermogenes, an African, probably at Carthage, about the beginning of the 3d century, was connected with the Gnostics, and belongs to them upon one side of his system. Like them, he busied himself with speculations respecting the origin of evil, and combatted the church doctrine of creation from nothing, on the ground that it made God the author of evil, — inasmuch as it would have been in the power of a being unconditioned by any external material, to have so constructed the world as to have precluded evil. At the same time, Hermogenes opposed the Gnostic doctrine of Emanation, as containing unworthy representations of God. From the beginning, he said, (adopting the Platonic doctrine of the ὕλη), two principles existed, — God, the only active and creative principle, and matter, the passive recipient material. The almighty God formed this latter; but there is something in it which resists the plastic creative principle, and which can be overcome only gradually. This resistance of matter to the formative power of God, is the ground of all evil. Tertullian came forward as the opponent of Hermogenes, in his tract Adversus Hermogenem.

THE CHURCH DOCTRINE OF CREATION FROM NOTHING.

At the close of this sketch of Gnosticism, we cast a brief glance at the doctrine of *God as the Creator*, and of *Creation from nothing*, as it was constructed in the first centuries of the church.

The Mosaic account in Genesis had represented creation as the pure and simple act of almighty aboriginating power, and had thereby precluded all that species of speculation which mixes and confounds the substance of God with the substance of the universe. This view had been adopted and restated in the Apostolic doctrinal system (Heb. xi. 3). The Christian belief in creation as a *miracle* of omnipotence, and in God as the *unconditioned* Author of all existence, was now to be asserted against the notion that God is not the true and real creator of all existence, but is only the former of a preexistent material, and also against the notion that all existence has of itself gradually developed from the one highest principle, — matter having a necessary existence, and necessarily conditioning the productive activity of the Supreme Deity. This belief was enunciated in its most distinct form, as a creation of the universe *from nothing* (Hermae Pastor lib. 2, Mand. 1). This inexplicable, ineffable act of pure creation, appeared meagre and unsatisfactory to the imaginative speculation and ingenious fancy of the Gnostics. In the place of it, they substituted their elaborate theory of emanation: a figment and fiction, in opposition to which, the Christian fathers enunciated only the more distinctly and firmly the doctrine of pure creation *de nihilo*, *ἐκ τοῦ μή ὄντος*, or, still more strictly, *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*.[1] Irenaeus enunciates it in the simplest manner possible, while the earlier Apologists, Justin and Tatian, present it in a somewhat Platonizing form.[2] This Platonizing form easily led to the doctrine of the Hyle, as we find it in Hermogenes, and which was opposed by Tertullian; while Origen sought to reconcile all differences by his doctrine of a creation from nothing, indeed, but of an *eternal* creation from nothing, — according to which, the universe is without beginning (see § 59). This theory was opposed by Methodius.

---

[1] *Hermas*, Pastor II. mand. 1: *Πρῶτον πάντων πίστευσον, ὅτι εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς, ὁ τὰ πάντα κτίσας καὶ καταρτίσας, καὶ ποιήσας ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα.* *Theophilus of Antioch*, Ad Autolycum II. 4: *Εἰ ὁ θεὸς ἀγέννητος καὶ ὕλη αγέννητος, οὐκ ἔτι ὁ θεὸς ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων ἐστί.* *Irenaeus*, Adversus Haereses II. 10, 4: Homines quidem de nihilo non possunt aliquid facere, sed de materia subjacenti; Deus autem materiam fabricationis ipse adinvenit. *Augustine*, Confessiones XII. 7: Fecisti coelum et terram non de te, nam esset aequale unigenito tuo, — et aliud praeter te non erat, unde faceres ea, et ideo de nihilo fecisti coelum et terram. *Augustine* De fide et symb. c. 2: Credimus omnia Deum fecisse de nihilo, quia etiamsi de aliqua materia factus est mundus, eadem ipsa materia de nihilo facta est ——. Hoc autem diximus, ne quis existimet contrarias sibi esse Scripturarum sententias; quoniam et omnia Deum fecisse de nihilo scriptum est (2 Mac. vii. 28), et mundum esse factum de informi materia (Sap. xi. 17). *Hippolytus*, in Genes., regards the creation of matter as the work of the first day. See Baumgarten-Crusius Dogmengeschichte, II. § 45, 46 — *Translator.*

[2] Justin. Apol. I 10: *Πάντα τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀγαθὸν ὄντα δημιουργῆσαι αὐτόν ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης δι᾽ ἀνθρώπους δεδιδάγμεθα.* In opposition to this, Theophilus makes the reply above.

§ 54.

MANICHAEISM, AND THE MANICHAEANS

Augustinus Contra Fortunatum, Contra Adamantum, Contra Faustum, et alia. Titus Bostrensis (about 360) Contra Manichaeos. De Beausobre Histoire crit de Manichée, et du Manichéisme. De Wegnern Manichaeorum indulgentiae, cum brevi totius Manichaeismi adumbratione. Baur Das Manichäische Religionssystem. Trechsel Ueber den Kanon, die Kritik, und Exegese, der Manichäer. Colditz Die Entstehung des Manichäischen Religionssystem. Mosheim Commentaries, Cent. III. § 39—56. Neander Church History, I. p. 478—506.

If Gnosticism presents the one phase of speculative heresy, Manichaeism presents the other. The Manichaeans agree with the Gnostics in fusing Oriental, and particularly Persian, theosophy with Christianity, and in thereby uniting the doctrine of Emanation with that of Dualism in their system; but they proceed more boldly, or, rather, more recklessly than do the Gnostics, since they entirely transmute Christianity into a Persian philosophy and theosophy. Of all the *Christian* heretical sects, the Manichaeans certainly are least deserving of the epithet Christian; for Manichaeism is at bottom a purely heathen scheme, invested in a symbolical drapery borrowed from Christianity. Yet there is sufficient of this drapery to justify its being treated as a sect having connections with Christianity, and running parallel with Gnosticism. Manichaeism differs from Gnosticism in that it contains no mixture of the Platonic philosophy, has no connection with Judaism, and as a sect came into no direct relations with the Catholic church.

1. After the Persians under the *Sassanides* (from 227) had freed themselves from the Parthian yoke, and had restored their ancient constitution, a new zeal awoke for the old religion of the country. Individual men, as well as whole councils convened by the Magi, labored for the restoration of the religion of Zoroaster in its purity, and in proportion as this zeal became more intense, the opposition to Christianity

increased. At such a time, and amidst the conjunctures of its excitements, the idea might very readily occur to a man of fiery and enterprising spirit, of showing the harmony with the pure doctrine of Zoroaster of Christianity when it had been freed from the foreign additions it had received from Judaism and other sources, and in this way of furthering the spread of Christianity in the Persian kingdom.

The accounts respecting the founder of the Manichaean sect,—called Màni by the Syrians and Persians, Manes by the Greeks, and Manichäus by the Latins,—are two-fold and inharmonious. The Occidental accounts, found in the writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Socrates and others, are all founded upon the narrative of a disputation which the bishop *Archelaus* of Cascar is said to have had with Mani. This narrative, which is extant only in a Latin version,—in Gallandi Bibl. patr. T. III.; Routh Reliqu. Sacr. P. IV.,—contains many contradictions and anachronisms, and has very probably lost credibility through the errors and mistakes of those who translated it from the Syriac into Greek, and from the Greek into Latin. The Oriental accounts,—in D'Herbelot Bibliothèque orientale (Sub. v. Mani); De Sacy Memoires, (Mirkhond's History of the Sassanides),—are much later, indeed, but on the whole are more trustworthy. According to the Occidental accounts, Mani obtained his wisdom from books which he had inherited, as a young manumitted slave *Cubricus* by name, from the widow of a certain *Terebinthus* or *Buddas* of Babylon. This latter had inherited them from a Saracen merchant *Scythianus*, who had embodied in them the knowledge of the Oriental and Greek philosophers which he had acquired in his extensive travels in the Orient, Egypt, and Greece. Cubricus came to Persia with his books, called himself Mani, formed a sect by combining doctrines drawn from these books with Christianity, and gained influence at the Persian court; but at length, hated by the Magi, and persecuted by a Persian prince because of ill success in his attempt to cure his disease, Mani was compelled to flee, and, being taken, was scourged to death. According to the Oriental accounts, Mani was a great mathematician, geographer, musician, and painter, who was converted from the doctrines of Zoroaster to Christianity, was a presbyter at Ahvaz, had frequent disputes with the Jews and the adherents of the system of Zoroaster, but who was at length excommunicated upon suspicion of being inclined to Zoroasterism and of being inimical to the Old Testament, and thereupon appeared as the founder of a new sect. He obtained (about 270) the favor of the Persian king Sapores I, but the insinuations of the Magi prevailed, and he was compelled to flee the court. He travelled as far as to India and China, and spent a long time in the province of Turkistan, where he dwelt in a cave, and composed a work full of splendid pictorial illustrations, in which he exhibited his doctrines in a symbolical dress. This work was called in Persian Ertenki-Mani, and was afterwards regarded by the Manichaeans as their Gospel. Manes found a favorable reception for himself and his book with the Persian king Hormuz (d. 271), and security in a city in Susiana. King Varanes (271–276) was less favorable towards him. Mani was forced to hold a discussion with the Magi, of which the result was, that he was condemned to death as a teacher of a false religion. He was scourged to death, and his skin was then stuffed and hung up before the gates of Djoudishapur in 277, as a terror to his adherents.

It is evident that there is much in these two accounts which cannot be true. Reliance can be placed only upon those points wherein both agree; viz.: that Mani, a founder of a sect, and hated by the Magi, was at first favored by the Persian kings, but was afterwards persecuted, compelled to flee, and finally horribly slain.

2. The *doctrines of Mani* were a mixture of Naturalism with Dualism and Fatalism.

He assumed two eternal kingdoms existing beside each other, and each limiting the other: the kingdom of light, of God, of the Mundane-Soul, of good; and the kingdom of darkness, of the Demon, of matter, of evil. In order to guard the borders of the kingdom of light, the king of this kingdom caused the aeon "Mother of Life" to emanate, and this bare the Archetypal Man, in order to set him in opposition to the powers of darkness. After long intestine conflicts, the demon kingdom finally became united in a contest with the kingdom of light. The contest was both spiritual and physical. The Archetypal Man, aided by the five pure elements, fights for possession of the kingdom of light, is overcome, and prays to the king of the light-kingdom. The king causes the Living-Spirit (spiritus vivens) to be emanated, for his assistance. The Arch-Man once more lifts himself up; but the powers of darkness have absorbed a portion of his light-nature. In this way, light and darkness have become mingled upon the middle ground between the two realms,—upon the borders of the spheres which have been broken through by war. This is the Mundane-Soul mixed with matter. Out of this mixture, God causes the visible world to be formed through the agency of the Living-Spirit,—in order that, in this new sphere, the imprisoned light-matter may be gradually separated from the darkness, the Mundane-Soul, now diffused through all nature as well as in the human world, be liberated from the chains of matter and restored to its old home in the kingdom of light, and the final victory of light over darkness, of life over death, be accomplished. The demons, and evil spirits chained to the stars, now attempt to thwart this plan. This introduces a new divine agency, two-fold in its character. Two exalted light-natures, —Christ, whom Mani calls Dextra luminis, *τοῦ ἀϊδίου φωτὸς υἵος*, and who has his seat in the sun and moon (hence called naves), and the Holy Spirit, who dwells in the aether,—undertake to purify, liberate, and attract to themselves, the Jesus patibilis,—this soul kindred to themselves now diffused through the visible world, and in bondage to it. This process of purification goes on through the human world, as well as through the world of physical nature. In every man there dwells an evil soul beside a soul of light, and it is the aim of the process of purification to give the latter the victory over the other, to unite with it the elements of light which are scattered in nature, especially in certain plants, and thus to open a way for it to enter the realm of light, in opposition to the hostile demons and their opposing religions, Judaism and Heathenism. This process goes on also in the vegetation of the natural world; since the principle of light, in conflict with matter, struggles up from the dark earth, and develops itself with ever increasing freedom in flowers and fruits. In order to complete this process, Christ himself, the lofty Spirit of the Sun, at length descends to earth in the appearance of a body, as a Redeemer. His crucifixion was apparent only, and was a symbol of the sufferings of the soul imprisoned and crucified, as it were, in matter. The doctrine of Christ was not correctly understood by the Apostles, and was afterwards still more falsified by the "Galilaeans." For this reason Christ promised a greater Apostle; this was the Paraclete (who was distinguished in Mani's scheme from the Holy Spirit), and appeared in Mani.

The Manichaeans naturally rejected the Old Testament altogether. Of the New Testament, they indeed received a part, but inasmuch as they proceeded upon the maxim that Mani's doctrine was the absolute reason, and all that did not harmonize therewith was irrational and false, they found in that portion of the Christian revelation which they did receive, a multitude of errors, accommodations, and falsifications, which could be separated from the truth only through the instructions of the Paraclete, or the Manichaean Reason. Yet, on the other hand, the Manichaeans, at least the later Manichaeans, made use of such pretended writings of the Apostles as the Gospels of Thomas and Philip, the Epistle to the Laodiceans, etc. Many of the other writings of Manes, besides the Ertenk (which is perhaps the ζῶν εὐαγγέλιον), stood in the highest estimation among them. Of these latter, the Epistola fundamenti (upon the foundations of belief), was especially esteemed, — of which the greater portion is still extant in fragments.[1]

3. While the Gnostics, with the exception of Marcion, would propagate their Gnosis only as the secret doctrine of the *πνευματικοί,* by the side of the general church creed of

---

[1] Fabricii Bibl. Graeca T. V. p. 284.

the *ψυχικοί*, the Manichaeans, on the contrary, constituted one formal and visible *church*, composed of two grades,—the Auditores, *κατηχούμενοι*, and the Electi, Perfecti, *τέλειοι*, The former, who were the great mass, were taught the Manichaean doctrines only in their symbolical costume, without unveiling their interior meaning, and were released from the observance of the more difficult rules and prescripts of the system, through the instrumentality of the Manichaean "indulgentiae," and the intercessions of the Elect. The Elect, on the contrary, who possessed the esoteric truth, were obliged to practise the most extreme austerity in order to give the good soul the superiority over the evil. Their asceticism was subdivided into the "signaculum oris,"—Manichaean purity in word and food, the latter involving abstinence from flesh, eggs, milk, and wine even at the communion; the "signaculum manuum,"—avoidance of injuring the life of plants and animals, and of all acts infringing upon material life generally; and the "signaculum sinus,"—chastity and celibacy. From this class of the Elect, the presiding officers of the sect were chosen. At the head of the whole body stood the Princeps, Mani's representative; under him, after the pattern of Christ's twelve apostles, there were twelve Magistri; under these, after the pattern of the seventy or seventy-two disciples of Christ, seventy-two bishops; and under these there were presbyters, deacons, and itinerant evangelists.

The worship of the Manichaean Auditores was very simple. They observed Sunday with fasting, as the day of the Sun. The *Βῆμα* was their great yearly festival; observed, in March, in memory of the martyrdom of their Paraclete. A gorgeously decorated pulpit was placed in their assembly room, and all prostrated themselves before it. Baptism and the Supper were a part of the secret ritual of the Electi. These latter were initiated by baptism, probably with oil.

4. Not long after the death of Mani, his sect had extended itself not only in the East but also in Northern-Africa, and in the European part of the Roman Empire. Diocletian, in 296, issued an edict against them in Africa. He ordered severe punishments for the mass of them, and death at the

stake for the leaders, on the ground that the Manichaeans were a Persian sect hostile to the Empire. Yet the sect continued to spread, and its principles were adopted sometimes openly and sometimes in secret.

Fanatic-Ascetical Sects.

§ 55.

THE MONTANISTS AND CHILIASM.

Wernsdorf De Montanistis. Kirchner De Montanistis. Schwegler Der Montanismus und die christliche Kirche im 2ten Jahrhundert.[1] Neander Church History, I. 509–527, 649 sq. Mosheim Commentaries, Cent. II. § 66, 67; Cent. III. § 38.

While the Judaistic, and especially the Oriental-theosophic, sects perverted all the essential principles of Christianity, and transmuted it into a totally corrupt and heterogeneous scheme, there were other sects who diverged from the catholic system only in respect to some particular points of doctrine and practice. Such were the *Montanists*. These received the general truths of Christianity as understood by the universal church, but substituted for Christian soberness and wisdom a fanatical enthusiasm that led to a falsification of some particulars in the creed, but more especially in the ethics and regimen of the church. This error had its source in the spiritual pride of the ascetic, which again was the fruit of mistaken views of truth, and a misdirected earnestness of character.

---

[1] The work of Schwegler is marked by the characteristic of the Tübingen school, — sweeping assertion without proof. Among its positions are the following: Montanism is the Petrinism of the 2d century, an offshoot of Ebionitism; Montanus is not a historical personage; Maximilla and Priscilla with Montanus were the Montanistic Trinity, — the doctrine of the Trinity being first broached by the Montanists; the name Paraclete was not borrowed by the sect from John, but the so-called John borrowed it from them, etc. etc.

In the year 157, according to Epiphanius, or, according to Eusebius, in the year 171, *Montanus* appeared as the founder of a sect, first at Ardaban upon the borders of Phrygia and Mysia, and afterwards at Pepuza in Phrygia. He had but recently professed Christianity, and his apprehension of the distinction between the flesh and the spirit was very dim and imperfect. He asserted that God at certain times, through the bestowment of the Paraclete, calls forth in the church special prophets whose utterances have positive authority, in order to impart to men new and extraordinary revelations, — not indeed respecting the immutable fundamentals of Christianity, but in respect to morality, church discipline, and practical life generally. He claimed that he was himself such a prophet; and afterwards two prophetesses, *Maximilla* and *Priscilla*, joined themselves to him. The glowing zeal of the new party formed for the open and bold confession of Christianity in the midst of the heathen, — a zeal whose morbid extravagance escaped notice amidst the peculiar occurrences of the time; their strict ascetic ethics, for which all earthly enjoyment, even that of science and literature, was intrinsically sinful; the attractiveness of the higher illumination which they so earnestly insisted was only the continuance of a supernatural agency confessedly exercised in the previous history of the church; and the definiteness of their announcements regarding the future, founded partly upon the Scriptures and partly upon the hopes and longings of a persecuted church, — all these causes, combined with the perverseness and sometimes the heterodox character of their hot-headed opponents, gained many friends for the Montanists in the youthful church. Of these, the most distinguished were the Carthaginian presbyter *Tertullian* and the Roman bishop *Eleutherus*. The former embraced Montanism in his later, though perhaps not in his latest, years, and wrought it over into a more systematic whole (see § 58). Very soon, however, influential voices in the church, — as, for example, that of *Claudius Apollinaris* bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, — were raised against a separatistic party which, in its pseudo-spirituality, contemned the whole visible church as a body of carnally minded *ψυχικοί*, and Montanism was by degrees condemned by all the Roman bishops, and by the most distinguished men in the church, either individually, or at provincial synods. Yet the Montanists maintained themselves as a distinct sect till into the 6th century, bearing, besides their usual name, the names of *Cataphrygians* (*οἱ κατὰ Φρύγας*), *Pepuzians*, and many other names of local or contemptuous signification.

The distinguishing tenets of the Montanists were of twofold character,— partly theoretical, and partly practical, according as they originated in their fanatical misapprehension of the true nature of Christian illumination, or according as they took their rise in their ascetical misconception of the real nature of Christian virtue. To the first class belonged their doctrine of the church and its propagation, and, in connection with this, their views respecting the *χαρίσματα*, particularly the *χαρίσματα προφετικά*. This Montanistic theory of the church, which they held in steadfast opposition to the Catholic theory (§ 32), was, in reality, the only doctrinal point wherein they differed from the church generally. The church of the Montanist was to be pure spirit, and not in any sense or manner an external visible organization.[1] Of this church, which would connect the working of the Holy Spirit with no outward institution whatsoever, and which consists solely of individual men illuminated by the Divine Spirit, he asserted a regular progressive development; not indeed with respect to its unchangeable regula fidei, but with respect to all the more outward rules of discipline, morality, and conduct. This development, however, was not that of natural expansion. It was to be brought about by means of extraordinary revelations and outpourings of the Divine Spirit imparted since the days of the apostles to particular individuals, and especially to Montanus. Through the extraordinary workings of the Paraclete promised by Christ (John xvi. 12, 13), the church was to be carried forward to the perfection of manhood.[1] Hence the *necessary* continuance of extraordinary gifts since the time of the apostles, particularly the gift of prophecy possessed by the Montanistic prophets, whose paroxysms were claimed to be the highest state of the Christian life, in which the prophet entirely lost his own individuality.[2]

---

[1] Ecclesia spiritus per spiritalem hominem, non ecclesia numerus episcoporum. Tertull. De pudic. c. 21. Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? Tertull. Exhort. castit. c. 7.

To the second class of Montanistic tenets, belonged their views respecting fasts, second marriage, flight in persecution, and church discipline. Besides the fasts at the celebration of Christ's Passion, the Montanists would have many other yearly and weekly fasts observed by requirement; second marriage was entirely forbidden to a Christian, because marriage was an indissoluble connection in respect to the spirit also; the flight of a Christian from persecution the Montanists declared, contrary to the teaching of Christ (Matt. xxiv. 16), to be a sin; and with regard to church discipline they harmonized entirely with the rigorous principles of the Novatians (comp. § 34, 2). The Montanists also zealously defended Chiliasm. Montanus taught that his favorite residence, Pepuza in Phrygia, was to be the centre of the millennial kingdom, and that the millennial reign was close at hand. In this, however, the Montanists harmonized with a very general sentiment in the Catholic church at this time, though their views of the nature of Christ's reign and kingdom were somewhat more crude and materializing. The church very generally, in the 2d century, had earnestly seized upon the

---

[1] Regula quidem fidei,—says Tertullian De virgg. veland. c. 1,—una omnino est, sola immobilis et irreformabilis. Hac lege fidei manente, cetera jam disciplinae et conversationis admittunt novitatem correctionis; operante scilicet et proficiente usque in finem gratia Dei. Propterea Paracletum misit Dominus, ut, quoniam humana mediocritas omnia semel capere non poterat (Joh. xvi. 12, 13), paulatim dirigeretur et ordinaretur et ad perfectum perduceretur disciplina ab illo vicario Domini spiritu sancto. Quae est ergo Paracleti administratio nisi haec, quod disciplina dirigitur, quod scripturae revelantur, quod intellectus reformatur, quod ad meliora proficitur? . . Justitia primo fuit in rudimentis, natura Deum metuens; dehinc per legem et prophetas promovit in infantiam; dehinc per evangelium efferbuit in juventutem; nunc per Paracletum componitur in maturitatem.

[2] The doctrine of an *ecstatic* prophecy (necesse est excidat sensu, Tertull. C. Marc. IV. 22), was held by the Montanists alone, in the ancient church.

Chiliastic theory, as a support and consolation under terrible suffering and persecution.

The conclusion of this account of Montanism conducts naturally to a brief *Sketch of Chiliasm.* This scheme is the ultimate development of the later-Jewish idea of a Messianic kingdom, as it appears, first, in the system of the Judaistic-Gnostic Cerinthus. Gentile-Christians afterwards received it from Jewish-Christians, chiefly upon the strength of the Old Testament representations literally interpreted, though modifying it more or less in accordance with their own more spiritual conceptions of the subject. The principal features in Chiliasm were: first, the expectation of a future outward and visible victory of the church at the end of *this present* world, which, it was very commonly supposed, would happen at the close of the first six thousand years (Ps. xc. 4); and secondly, a long continued, so-called thousand-years reign of the saints upon the *renovated* earth, in blessed companionship with Christ and all the holy. During this reign, Antichrist, the power of sin under a pretended Christian form, would reach its acme, when Christ would hold the final judgment, and the *eternal* state would begin, for both the holy and the unholy. The Chiliastic expectation was founded, partly upon those passages in the Old Testament prophecies which describe the glory of the future church, partly upon various intimations in the gospels and apostolical epistles, and partly upon the locus classicus Rev. xx., — a passage which in its total meaning can receive its full interpretation, like all prophecy, only ex eventu. Favored by the distressed external condition of the church of the 2d and 3d centuries, the Chiliastic idea rapidly spread through the church, and Chiliasm was distinctly propounded for the consolation and encouragement of the persecuted believer by not a few church teachers. Among them were *Papias*, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia in the first half of the 2d century (Euseb. III. 39), *Justin Martyr*, *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, *Methodius*, and *Lactantius*. Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. V. 31, 1), in speaking of those opposers of Chiliasm who in other respects were orthodox, and agreed with the Gnostics only upon this point, goes so far as almost to denominate Anti-Millenarianism of the nature of heresy; and yet neither Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. I. 10; III. 4), nor Tertullian (De virgg. vel. c. 1; Adv. Prax. c. 2; De praescr. haeret. c. 13), when specifying the ancient articles of Christian faith, and giving summaries of the received doctrine, mention Chiliasm as an acknowledged tenet of the church. No distinct traces of Chiliasm are to be found in the writings of other fathers of this early time,—as *Clemens Romanus, Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Athenagoras*, and *Theophilus of Antioch*.

During the 2d and 3d centuries, we find only few instances of direct opposition to Chiliasm, either in individuals or in local churches. Individual attacks proceeded chiefly, either from Gnostics whose hyper-spiritualism constituted the opposite extreme to the Chiliastic materialism, or from men within the church who were heated and prejudiced by a violent polemic temper. Of these latter was *Gaius*, a presbyter at Rome (about 200), who, in his zeal against the Montanist *Proculus*, declared Chiliasm to be the pure invention of Cerinthus, and that the Apocalypse itself was the work of this Gnostic. Of the Anti-Chiliastic churches, that of Alexandria stands almost alone. The opposition, here, began under the leadership of *Clement* and *Origen*, and in the Alexandrine school it reached its highest energy. Towards the end of the 3d century, the bishop *Nepos* of Arsinoe in Egypt stood forth in defence of Chiliasm, in a work, levelled at the Origenistic school, entitled *Ἔλεγχος τῶν ἀλληγοριστῶν*; and after the death of Nepos, *Coracion*, a former pupil of Origen, continued the defence in opposition to *Dionysius* the bishop of Alexandria, and his entire church. Coracion probably maintained a gross form of Chiliasm, and was supported by a not inconsiderable number of country presbyters with their churches (Euseb. VII. 24). But the opponents of Chiliasm finally triumphed. The patient wisdom and able arguments of Dionysius at length prevailed, and Coracion revised and recanted his views. From this time onward Chiliasm declined, either through silence or positive recanting on the part of its adherents. This was owing, first, to the steady opposition of the church to Montanism, and secondly, to the increasing strength and the dawning external splendor of the church, which turned the eye away from the future to the present, and led to a desire for the continuance of the present earthly condition, as persecution and distress had previously produced a desire for its cessation. Chiliasm was never, even in the first centuries, the church *creed* or the *oecumenical doctrine;* the vaticinative conjectural character of its tenets, and the difficulty of interpreting the Scripture data, constituting a bar to its being fixed in a definite and authoritative statement.[1]

Rationalistic Sects.

§ 56.

PATRIPASSIANS, NOMINAL TRINITARIANS, AND HUMANITARIANS.

Baur Dreieinigkeitslehre I. 243–305. Dorner Person Christi I. 497–562, 697–732.

As in Montanism a morbid emotiveness and a gloomy severity opposed itself to genuine Christian sobriety, so in some other sects a one-sided abstraction stood in contrariety to the fulness and mystery of Christian truth. It was natural that, very early, the human understanding should begin to shape the doctrines of the church in accordance with its own forms of conception, and that the doctrine of the *Deity of Christ* and of the *Trinity* should above all others become the subject-matter of such criticism. With reference to this doctrine, three classes of sectaries were formed during the first three centuries, who attempted to exhaust and master this infinite mystery, revealed in Scripture and handed down in the Church, by the limited powers of a finite understanding. In this attempt, according to the intensity of the effort, the mind was carried farther away from the revealed dogmatic material, and, as a consequence, this fundamental doctrine itself was more or less mutilated and lost by the sectary. Some, from a practical feeling which in itself considered was highly estimable, sought to assert the deity of Christ in the most decisive and complete manner.[1] But in doing it, they denied the existence of more than one person in the divine essence, and saw in Christ the one single person of God the Father. Others, from a merely speculative interest accompanied with a shallow argumentation, denied the proper deity of Christ, while they conceded a species of divinity to him, and a peculiar connection with the divine nature, and made of the Son and the Holy Ghost merely two divine powers. And others still, declared Jesus to be a mere man, and denied his Godhead in every sense of the term.

---

[1] Though not incorporated into any of the creeds of the church, Chiliasm has been tolerated more or less, and has been the faith of some earnest and spiritual minds, as well as of many fanatical and heretical spirits. When it has taken on its grosser form, and been connected with positively heretical sentiments, it has been condemned in creeds. The Augsburg Confession condemns Millenarianism in connection with the doctrine of a limited future punishment; both tenets being held by the Anabaptists. "Damnant Anabaptistas, qui sentiunt hominibus damnatis ac diabolis finem poenarum futurum esse. Damnant et alios, qui spargunt Judaicos opiniones, quod ante resurrectionem mortuorum pii regnum mundi occupaturi sint, ubique oppressis impiis." (Hase Libri Symbolici p. 14.) The English Confession of Edward VI., — from which the XXXIX. Articles were afterwards condensed, — condemns it in nearly the same terms as the Augsburg; and the Belgic Confession guards the statement respecting the Second Advent of Christ, by teaching that the time of its occurrence is unknown to all created beings, and that it will not take place until the number of the elect is complete. See Niemeyer Collectio pp. 600, 387. — *Translator.*

Anti-Trinitarians,[2] consequently, were of three classes; but inasmuch as the first two of them, alone, attempted a refutation of the church doctrine of the Trinity, the name is more particularly applied to them. The third class, adopting the lowest humanitarian view of the Person of Christ, came but slightly into the great Trinitarian controversy.

---

[1] Τί *οὖν κακὸν ποιῶ, δοξάζων τὸν Χριστόν*,—said Noëtus when he was arraigned before a synod. Hippolyt. C. Noët. c. 2.

[2] Or *Monarchians*, ("Monarchiam tenemus" was their watchword; See Tertuil. C. Prax. c. 3.) i. e. Unitarians, defenders of the doctrine of *μόνη ἀρχή* in God.

1. The *Patripassians* constituted the first class of Anti-Trinitarians. They would assert the deity of Christ, but held that the church doctrine of the Trinity is incompatible with the doctrine of the divine Unity. Hence they affirmed that there is only one divine Person, namely God the Father; who remains, ever, a single person simple and pure, merely taking the *name* Son when he becomes incarnate, or else assuming different *relationships*, being the Father previous to self-manifestation, and the Son or Logos when he comes forth from his concealed mode of existence and reveals himself. As the Logos, this single divine Person was the animating soul of the human body of Christ; a human rational soul in Christ being denied. To the Patripassians belonged: —

a. *Praxeas* of Asia Minor (the home of Monarchianism), who acquired the distinction of a Confessor in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, but afterwards, about 200, taught this erroneous doctrine at Rome, and was opposed by Tertullian (Adv. Praxeam). It is not quite certain, from the passages in Tertullian (Adv. Prax. c. 10, 14, 26, compared with c. 27), which of the two shades of Patripassianism Praxeas favored. Perhaps different modes of conception and statement arose among his disciples. According to Tertullian, Praxeas towards the close of his life made a softening explanation and perhaps a recantation of his sentiments;

b. *Noëtus* at Smyrna, about 230, who was excommunicated for heresy (See Theodoret. Haer. fabb. III. 3, and Epiphan. Haer. 57),[1] and was opposed by Hippolytus (Contra Haeresin Noëti). His theory was essentially Patripassian, though with some diverging peculiarities;

c. *Beryl*, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, about 240 (Euseb. VI. 33), whom Origen, who had been invited to assist by an Arabian synod in 244, convinced of his error, so that he renounced it (according to Jerome De. vir. ill. c. 60), and wrote a letter to Origen thanking him for the light he had received.[1]

---

[1] *Ἕνα φασὶν εἶναι ϑεὸν καὶ πατέρα· . . . καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀόρατον εἶναι καὶ δρώμενον· καὶ γεννητὸν καὶ ἀγέννητον, ἀγέννητον μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, γεννητὸν δὲ ὅτε ἐκ παρϑένου γεννηϑῆναι ἠϑέλησεν· . . . τοῦτον καὶ υἱὸν ὀνομάζουσι καὶ πατέρα, πρὸς τὰς χρείας τοῦτο κἀκεῖνο καλούμενον.* — Theodoret. Haer. fabb. III. 3.

2. The second class of Anti-Trinitarians attributed no proper deity to Christ, but only a species of divinity. They held that the concealed deity manifests himself through two powers, which stream forth from him like rays from the sun,—an *enlightening* power, the divine Reason, the Logos (subdivided into the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, or the immanent self-conscious reason of the deity, and the λόγος προφορικός, or the active creative reason), and an *enlivening* power, the Holy Ghost. With the divine Logos, the man Jesus was from his birth connected in a far higher degree than were any of the prophets, and as thus standing under this illumination and guidance, Jesus is called the Son of God.

Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch from 260, is a representative of this second class of Anti-Trinitarians,—a man of great vanity and love of display, and who was also accused of unchastity. He was declared heretical by two Antiochian synods in 264 and 269. The first of these synods he succeeded in satisfying in respect to his orthodoxy; but by the latter, through the aid of the presbyter *Malchion*, his heterodoxy was proved to him, and he was deposed from his office. He found, however, a powerful supporter in Zenobia queen of Palmyra, and it was not till after she was conquered by Aurelian (272) that the decree of this synod was executed,—on a new motion of the bishops, and after the emperor had referred the matter to the decision of the bishop of Rome. A party of *Samosatenians* or *Paulians* continued till into the 4th century (Euseb. VII. 27–30; Comp. Theodoret. Haer. fabb. II. 8; Epiphan. Haer. 65).

---

[1] *Ullmann* (De Berylo Bostreno), and in part *Neander* also, has attempted to render it probable that Beryl should not be reckoned as a Patripassian. It is plain, however, from the passage concerning Beryl in Eusebius VI. 33, that the chief element in his system was a patripassian one, though moulded and shaped somewhat peculiarly. The godhead of Christ, according to an unbiassed interpretation of this passage in Eusebius, was merely the godhead of the Father which by streaming through a human nature (probably only a human body; comp. Neander I. 593) constructed and constituted the personality of the Son of God.

Sabellius, a presbyter of Ptolemais in Pentapolis (250–260) the most thoughtful of all the primitive Anti-Trinitarians, is to be reckoned in this second class, although he stands to some extent between both classes, and has a decided proclivity to the patripassian theory, particularly that of Beryl. Sabellius belongs to the second class, in so far as he understands by the Logos and the Holy Spirit two powers streaming forth from the divine essence, through which God works and reveals himself,[1] but recedes from the second class and approximates to the first, and particularly to Beryl, inasmuch as he did not hold that Christ was merely an ordinary man upon whom the divine Logos wrought in a special manner, but asserted, rather, that the divine power of the Logos formed the very human consciousness itself of Christ during his life upon earth, — which divine power, however, issuing from himself, and thus forming a unity with Christ, God retracted again into himself at the ascension of Christ (Dionys. Alex. in Euseb. VII. 6, and Epiphan. Haer. 62). The doctrine of Sabellius was not deemed heretical in Pentapolis until Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, opposed it both with arguments and episcopal authority. The *Sabellians* still existed as a sect in the 4th century, in Rome and Mesopotomia.

3. To the third class of heretics, who held Christ to be a mere man, and absolutely rejected the doctrine of the deity of Christ in every form, belonged: —

a. The *Ebionites;* see § 43.

b. *Theodotus*, a tanner of Byzantium, who about the year 200 propagated his doctrine in Rome. He taught that Christ was a mere man (Euseb. V. 28; Theodoret. Fabb. Haer. II. 5; Epiphan. Haer. 54; Appendix lib. Tertull. de praescrr. c. 53), but at the same time recognized him as the

---

[1] All self-manifestation of the Godhead, according to Sabellius, constitutes a plurality, not of *ὑπόστασεῖς* but, of *μορφαί, σχήματα, ἐνεργεῖαι,* and is merely an *ἐκτείνεσθαι, πλατύνεσθαι, μεταμορφοῦσθαι, μετασχηματίζεσθαι* of power. Hence Athanasius, Contra Arian. IV. 13, sketches the Sabellian theory as follows: *Ἡ μονὰς πλατυνθεῖσα γέγονε τριάς. Ὁ πατὴρ ὁ αὐτὸς μέν ἐστι, πλατύνεται δὲ εἰς υἱὸν καὶ πνεῦμα.*

Messiah promised in the Old Testament, and probably conceded his supernatural birth. Theodotus was excommunicated by the Romish bishop Victor, and the venerated confessor Natalis, who had been appointed by the Theodotians as their bishop in his place, was brought back into the Catholic church by what he deemed to be the nocturnal chastisement of angels (Euseb. V. 28). A little party of Theodotians continued to exist into the 3d century, devoting themselves particularly to the dialectics of Aristotle, and to mathematics. Their leader, after the death of Theodotus about 200, was *Artemon* or *Artemas*, and hence they were also called *Artemonites.*

c. The *Alogi*,[1] *Ἄλογοι* (so named first by Epiphanius Haer. 51), were a sect who existed probably towards the close of the 2d century, and were perhaps connected with the Theodotians and Artemonites. They rejected, in violent opposition to Montanism, the doctrine of the continuance of Charismata in the church, and that of the millennial reign. They denied the genuineness not only of the Apocalypse but also of John's Gospel, — ascribing both to Cerinthus. Their rejection of the fourth Gospel probably sprung from their opposition to the doctrine of the deity of Christ, and of the union of the Logos with human nature in him. The history of this sect is obscure, and it is possible that the name Alogi was only a general one for all who rejected the Logos-Doctrine.

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

Dorner Person Christi, I. 400–503; 563–696. Baur Dreieinigkeitslehre, I. 129–243. Meier Trinitatslehre.

In order to complete the view of the early Anti-Trinitarianism, and of its relation to the early church, we cast a glance at the principal features in the *Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, and, more particularly, of the *Logos-Doctrine, during the first three centuries.*

That God, the Author of all existence, has also become the Redeemer and Sanctifier of sinful and estranged humanity, was from the first a fundamental truth in the Christian church, and upon this fact rested that *practical* belief in God as Tri-une both in his essence and his manifestation, which was only gradually formed into a *speculative* scientific statement (see § 82 seq. and § 124, 1). The historical development of this doctrine naturally took start from its historical centre-point, viz.: the actual Incarnation of God in Christ. The scientific construction of the Doctrine of the Trinity thus had its origin primarily in a *living belief;* namely, in the practical faith and feeling of the primitive Christians, that Christ was the co-equal Son of God. At the same time, in the dialectic formation of this doctrine, Christianity came into contact with many ideas, which, though mere abstractions and needing the rectification and enlivenment of revealed religion, were yet a fore-shadowing of the Christian dogma of the Trinity, and served as its illustration and corroboration.[1] These ideas were found particularly in the Oriental, the Platonic, and the Jewish-Alexandrine and Jewish philosophies.

---

[1] Heinichen De Alogis, Theodotianis, atque Artemonitis.

The ancient *Oriental* systems of Emanation made the distinction of a concealed inapprehensible essence of God, and a revelation of the same, through which latter alone could man rise up towards the Deity. Partly through Oriental influences, and partly as an imperfect echo of the Old-Testament revelation, a kindred distinction between the Original Essence and the Word, or Wisdom, came into the Jewish theology. Again, in *Plato* this same general distinction appears, between the intrinsically incomprehensible essence of God, *τὸ αὐτὸ ἀγαϑόν*, and the revealer of the same in the universe, the *ϑεὸς γενητός* or Mundane-Soul who animates both individual bodies and the universe as a whole. This Platonic Dyad, the new Platonists of Alexandria under Oriental influences formed into a Triad, and thus there arose the New-Platonic Trinity, — of the *ὄν* as the abstract conception of perfection, the *νοῦς* as the highest self-consciousness, and the *ψυχὴ τοῦ κόσμου* which creatively realizes the ideas of the *νοῦς* in the formation of the world. Next, the *Alexandrine Jews* combine the Platonic and Jewish-Oriental elements into a peculiar whole. They found the idea of an independent self-revelation of the concealed Deity in the Jewish theology, and merely exchanged it for the kindred Platonic idea. Hence Philo's distinction between *εἶναι* and *λέγεσϑαι*, or Being in itself and the external manifestation of Being, and between the *ὄν* and the *λόγος τοῦ ὄντος*, — with the various shadings of these conceptions in the Philonic system (Qu. Deus immut.). Under such Alexandrine influences, and those more general influences proceeding from the Jewish theological schools, not a few *Jews* at the time of Christ were adopting the idea of a Logos, though not in any general manner, nor in the one and the same form. All did not, for example, conceive the Logos to be an independent personality, but many regarded it as merely the indwelling reason of God, existing either as immanent and concealed, the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*, or as outworking and revelatory, the *λόγος προφορικός*.

---

[1] Modern Ontology itself, does not find the Tri-unity of God intrinsically absurd. All life, — the metaphysician contends, — is activity. God's life, or immanent activity, as that of self-conscious Spirit, requires and is an eternal intercommunication, within his *own* Being, between Subject and Object (Father and Son). For, in this reference, the Universe cannot be the Object; since, in this case, the Creation would be eternally necessary in order to the Divine self-consciousness, and, as thus eternally conditioning the being of God, would be God. The eternal Object, antithetic to the eternal Subject, must therefore be of one and the same eternal and necessary essence, and yet a distinction within it; the Son must be consubstantial with the Father, and yet another than He (*ἄλλος καὶ ἄλλος*, not *ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο*). But mere duality is mere distinction without unity; an antithesis unharmonized. Only in trinality therefore, — consequently only through a third hypostatical distinction, — is the antithesis harmonized, and the plurality of persons reduced into the unity of essence.

But howsoever the Logos may have been conceived of among the Jews, it is certain that at the time of Christ the Jewish theology by no means generally associated the idea of the Logos with that of the *Messiah*. The general Jewish view of the Person of the Messiah, as plainly appears from Justin Martyr's polemical dialogue with the Jew, was, that he was to be a merely human being, pre-eminently gifted, and who, upon being consecrated to his Messianic office by Elias, would be endued with the requisite divine power, — a view which was adopted afterwards by the Jewish-Christian sect of the *Ebionites*, who regarded the baptism in Jordan as the moment when the supernatural endowment was bestowed. The first, to definitely apply, in apostolical purity, the Jewish theological idea of the Logos to Jesus, was the *Apostle John*, who in the introduction to his gospel rectified and legitimated the Logos-idea, and taught that that distinction in the divine Essence which had been the object of a vague and fanciful speculation, had actually appeared in Jesus Christ, as the eternal source of all created life, and of all human salvation.

The doctrine of the Logos, consequently, afforded the best instrument for speculative investigation into that divine nature and dignity of Jesus which the church had practically recognized since the time of the Apostles.

After the *Apostolical Fathers* had merely asserted in single and simple declarations the deity of Christ, the *Apologists*, and particularly the educated Platonists among them, found the first occasion to develop the doctrine of the Logos. According to *Justin Martyr*, God in his secret essence is above all designation; only through the Logos has he made any manifestation of himself at any time (Apol. maj. p. 63, Dial. c. 56, 60); the Logos is properly the Son of God and God (Dial. p. 357). From eternity, this *λόγος ἐνθίαθετος*, or indwelling Reason in God, has manifested itself by an independent emanation in realizing the plan of creation (Apol. maj. p. 56), without changing God's essence, — a fire from fire, a gush of thought from the thinking faculty (Dial. c. 61), not another than the Father as to will, but immanent and inworking in him, and inseparably connected with the ground-principle of the Father's being (Dial. p. 358). *Tatian* (Orat. c. Graec. p. 145) expresses himself similarly though more obscurely, as does also *Theophilus* (Ad Autol. II. p. 88, 100). The view of *Athenagoras* is somewhat more peculiar (Apol. p. 10, 11). The Son of God, according to him, is the Logos of the Father, both in idea and in activity; the Son and Father are one; the Son is in the

Father and the Father in the Son, by virtue of the unity and might of the common divine essence (τοῦ πνεύματος); the Son indeed was the πρῶτον γέννημα, but only in so far as he came forth from the divine immanency, to reduce chaos to creation, and thereby become the Logos in activity as well as in idea.

Irenaeus limits his speculations to what is practically fundamental in this doctrine. The distinction between a λόγος ἐνδιάϑετος and a λόγος προφορικός was not to his taste. How the Son is begotten from the Father surpasses all comprehension (Adv. Haer. II. 28). The essential in the Logos-doctrine is, that since God's essence does not immediately appear, he has from eternity manifested himself in and by the Logos; that the Logos became man in Christ, though at the same time belonging to the essence of God (IV. 7). God created the universe of and by himself, i. e. through his Word (II. 30, 9); the Father wills and commands, the Son acts and creates (IV. 7, 4; II. 28, 8).

Tertullian, on the contrary, more speculative than Irenaeus, attaches himself to the idea of the λόγος ἐνδιάϑετος and προφορικός. The λόγος, eternally with God, emanes from God into distinctness of being previous to any act of creation, but still remains one with God through the "divina substantia." There is, consequently, "una Dei substantia in tribus cohaerentibus, unus ambo," and the Son is "Deus de Deo" (Apologet. c. 21). This doctrinal statement, Tertullian afterwards defended against the germinating heresies of his age. It was now the time when the first two classes of Anti-Trinitans, above described, began their opposition to the church doctrine of the Trinity. They were agreed in a common opposition to the distinction of Father and Son as two different personalities, but differed from each other in their modes of opposition; the one moved by a so-claimed practical interest, the other by a speculative; the former and somewhat elder class characterized by a Judaistic tendency, the latter by a Gentilizing one. Against a representative of the first class of *Patripassians*, viz., against *Praxeas*, Tertullian defended the church doctrine, probably having in his eye two different modifications of the patripassian theory. In this controversy he developed his own doctrinal statement still more definitely (Adv. Prax. c. 2 sqq.). "I and the Father," says Christ, "are one"; not εἷς, but ἕν; not in unity of person, but in unity of essence.

Hippolytus, the learned pupil of Irenaeus, in the 3d century sustained the same polemic relation to *Noëtus*, that Tertullian had to Praxeas. Nearly contemporaneously with him, the presbyter *Novatian* at Rome, in a work entitled De regula fidei or De Trinitate, opposed partly the patripassian party, and partly a party who declared that Christ was a mere man; this latter probably being that of *Theodotus* and *Artemon*, which though originating elsewhere appears to have fixed itself at Rome (Comp. Euseb. V. 28, and Epiphan. Haer. 54). With the Theodotians were connected, it is likely, those opponents of the writings of the Apostle John whom Epiphanius denominates the *Alogi.* Against all these sectaries and heresies, Novatian argues the deity of Christ, asserting, against the Patripassians in particular, that the Son's unity of being with the Father does not pertain to the "unitas personae," but to the "societas amoris et concordiae," since the Son is united with the Father by "communio substantiae."

Lactantius, Institut. IV. 29, in like manner declares that there is one God as to origin and essence,—who, yet, is two as Father and Son,—and one, since the One is as two and the two are as One.

Such was the historical development of the Logos-Doctrine *previous to, and outside of, the influence of the Alexandrine School.* Within this school, the formation of this doctrine was somewhat different.

Clement's writings contain the germ of the *Alexandrine Trinitarianism.* He starts from the idea (Qu. div. c. 37), that love moves God to impart life and happiness ad extra; and the first act of this love was the generation of the Logos. Thus the Logos is the ἀρχὴ ϑεῖα τῶν πάντων, through whom the universe is derived from God, and is ideally grounded in him (Protrept. p. 5). At the same time, the Father and Son, according to Clement, are ἓν ἄμφω (Paedag. III. 12, 268), yet as a πρῶτον and a δεύτερον αἴτιον (Strom. VII. pp. 700, 708). This latter statement, however, in accordance with the Alexandrine idea of an eternal genesis, which was also held by the New Platonists, is not to be understood as implying a generation of the Son in time, but an eternal generation.

Origen develops the Clementine theory still further. God the Father, according to him, is the aboriginal source of all being and all divine life; but the central point of God's entire life-development is the Logos, who is the fountain of all revelation and communication of life (T. II. 2, in Joh.; T. XV. 10, in Matth.), and adapts his communications to the different necessities of rational existences (T. I. 22, in Joh.; T. XIX. in Joh. p. 387). Origen's view is opposed to that of the Gnostics,—who made as many different personalities as there were varieties in the forms of the manifestation of the Logos; and also to that of the Anti-Trinitarians,—who regarded the Logos as only a particular mode or relation of the divine essence. The Logos, in Origen's theory, is a distinct and personal being (T. II. 2, in Joh.; C. Cels. VIII. 12). This position Origen maintained in opposition to Beryl's Patripassianism, and succeeded in converting Beryl to it. Origen also developed the Clementine theory still further, in striving to disconnect the idea of time from the generation of the Logos, while holding to the distinct personality of the Logos (T. I. 32, in Joh.). The begetting of the Son is not a transient act, but an eternally continuing one (Hom. 19, in Jerem.). The term "generation," moreover, is only a symbolical one, to denote that the being of the Logos has its ground in the Father's being, as the reflection has its ground in the original beam of light. It is not employed in the sense of a sensuous imparting of the divine substance, and, consequently, not in the sense of a γέννησις ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ ϑεοῦ, *if this phraseology is so interpreted.*[1] The term

---

[1] See the "Acta" of a disputation of Origen with a Gnostic, in Jerome, Opp. ed. Mart. IV. 413.

"generation" denotes, rather, an ἑτερότης τῆς οὐσίας, — meaning thereby an ἑτερότης τῆς ὑποστάσεως (Comp. T. XIV. in Joh. p. 218, ed. Hu.; De Orat. c. 15; C. Cels. VIII. 12).[1] The ideas of Origen passed from his school into the Oriental church, and there came in conflict with two heretical theories each the opposite of the other.

First, with those of *Sabellius*. This theorist, — making use of materials then existing, particularly in the fragments of the so-called Egyptian Gospel and in the Clementines, — stands midway between the two classes of Anti-Trinitarians, inasmuch as he connects the position, that the one and same person receives different names according to the different relations it assumes,[2] with the position, that different powers stream forth from the divine essence, which are modes of manifestation merely of one and the same divine Subject. This theory, Sabellius contended was the strictly orthodox Trinitarianism, — in his own phraseology, a ὁμοουσία in the Triad and τρία πρόσωπα. Owing to its distance from the East, and its imperfect understanding of the case, the Occidental Church was perhaps somewhat inclined to favor a theory so simple in its structure. But it was not so with the Alexandrine School. *Dionysius of Alexandria* expressed his dissent in an extreme manner.[3] He went so far as to declare that the Son of God, in respect to the Father, is ξένος κατ' οὐσίαν. This erroneous statement naturally elicited much opposition. Complaint was made to bishop *Dionysius of Rome*, who addressed a letter to the Alexandrines, condemning the view of Sabellius, but at the same time asserting distinctly the idea of unity of essence in the Triad; whereupon Dionysius of Alexandria, in his Ἔλεγχος καὶ Ἀπολογία, retracted what was extravagant in his manner of expression, and expressed himself satisfied with the term ὁμοούσιος rightly understood.

Dionysius of Alexandria having thus rectified his own statement was prepared, towards the close of his life, to come forth yet more decidedly in another contest. At the end of the 3d century, the Origenistic Trinitarianism once more asserted itself in opposition to the Anti-Trinitarianism of *Paul of Samosata*, who now adopted the distinction of a λόγος ἐνδιάϑετος and

---

[1] Guericke would put this interpretation upon the Origenistic assertion of an ἑτερότης τῆς οὐσίας, because it was confessedly the chief aim of Origen to maintain the reality of the hypostatical distinction, and not at all to deny the doctrine of the Trinity. Whether, however, Origen really held the doctrine of the ὁμοουσίον is disputed among authorities. *Neander* declares that the writings of Origen were the great source of the Oriental doctrine of the ὁμοιουσίον. *Ritter* thinks that Origen held to a generation out of the essence, but by the will of the Father. *Baur* is of opinion that Origen wavered in his own mind between ὁμοουσίον and ὁμοιουσίον. *Meier* agrees with Neander. *Dorner* contends, with much ingenious reasoning and minute examination, that Origen held the church doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Father and Son. — *Translator.*

[2] "Μία ὑπόστασις, ὀνόματα δύο", — Athanas. Orat. IV. c. Arian c. 25.

[3] See the fragments of his work, in Athanas., De sententia Dionysii, and De decretis synodi Nic.

προφορικός in an *impersonal* sense, and denominated Jesus the Son of God, as a man illuminated by the Logos in a higher degree than any of the prophets had been.

If now we sum up the *Result of the development of the Logos-Doctrine in the first three centuries*, we find at the beginning of the 4th century two theories with respect to the Son of God, both opposed to those of the Anti-Trinitarian sects, and both obtaining currency within the church. These were the *Roman-Occidental*, which was by far the most prevalent, and the *Alexandrine-Oriental*. The two theories agreed, in teaching that the Son, as to his essence and nature, is different from all creatures, and also in holding the doctrine (which the West received from Origenism) of an eternal generation. The two theories differed, in that the Occidental insisted that the tenet of *μία οὐσία*, una substantia, in Father and Son, was necessary in order to preserve the unity of God and the dignity of the Son, while the Oriental believed that such a unity of essence was incompatible with the *μοναρχία* and the personal distinctions, and hence asserted, in order to the preservation of these latter, the *ἑτερότης τῆς οὐσίας*. Besides these two systems, we find at this time traces of the upspringing of a third party, who failed to grasp the Alexandrine idea of eternal generation as a derivation as to relationship but not as to time, who moreover urged to an extreme some of the positions which the Alexandrine school had maintained in opposition to Sabellianism and the Gnostic Emanationism, and who in this way began to give expression to the doctrine that the Son of God had a beginning of existence and was a creature. The conflict between these three systems, in which the Alexandrine would naturally furnish most opportunity for the superficiality of middle-minds to exert itself, while the Occidental carried within itself the pledge of final success, both determines and characterizes the general doctrinal development of the 4th century (Comp. § 82).

The *Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, as the author of regeneration and the divine life of faith, was from the beginning a fundamental part of the Christian belief, although the speculative determination of this dogma did not keep pace even with that of the Deity of the Son. At the same time, its scientific construction followed on after that of the doctrine of the second person; and in proportion as the primitive fathers grasped the idea of the real presence and agency, in the church, of the Comforter promised by the Redeemer, and acquired a more profound apprehension of the Apostles' teachings and phraseology, in that proportion did they conceive of the *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* as a distinct divine personality, and maintain his hypostatical character in opposition to both classes of Anti-Trinitarians. *Justin Martyr* (Apol. maj. p. 56, comp. with p. 60) expressly designates three objects of worship,[1] — God, the Son of

---

[1] Justin, it is true, associates the angels with the Holy Spirit, but only as the latter is the archetype of all rational spirits. The objection that he confounds the Logos with the Holy Spirit is untenable (See Thiersch, in Zeitschrift für Luth. Theol. 1841. H. 2, S. 167).

God, and (as the third τάξις, p. 60) the Holy Spirit. *Tertullian* (Adv. Prax. c. 4) denominates the Holy Spirit the "gradus tertius trinitatis;" and *Origen* (T. II. c. 6. in Joh., and Comm. in Genes. init.) develops in the most distinct manner the idea of the personal subsistence of the Holy Spirit, and of the timelessness of his existence, although he defends the notion of his subordination and other kindred errors. These latter, however, were opposed and rejected, according to the testimony of Athanasius, by *Dionysius of Rome*, who in a sharp and clear dialectic statement asserted the co-equality of the Holy Spirit with the Logos.

CHAPTER SECOND.

PRINCIPAL CHURCH TEACHERS AND THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS.

§ 57.

THE APOSTOLICAL FATHERS, AND JUSTIN MARTYR.

Outside of the sectarian circle, and within the wide bounds of the Catholic church, we find first in the series of Christian teachers and writers those men who, as the immediate pupils of the Apostles, are denominated the *Apostolic Fathers*, Patres Apostolici.[1] They are the following: —

1. *Barnabas*, more properly *Joses*, a Levite from Cyprus who very early joined the church at Jerusalem (Acts iv. 36), consecrated his earthly possessions to its needs (Acts iv. 37), and afterwards was associated for a time with the apostle Paul (Acts ix. 27). According to Eusebius (I. 12), he was one of the Seventy disciples. One tradition makes him to have been the first bishop of Milan; another represents him as suffering martyrdom among the Jews in Cyprus, after a residence of some time at Rome and Alexandria. Christian antiquity attributes to Barnabas an anonymous *Epistle*, composed originally in Greek, of which the greater part has been preserved, and very early translated into a Latin version which is still extant. It betokens an Alexandrine taste in its allegorizing tone, but at the same time a purely Christian apprehension of truth, and an inward piety. In its moderate

---

[1] Sanctorum Patrum, qui temporibus Apostolorum floruerunt, Opp. Coteler-rius. Paris. 1672; rec. Clericus. Antv. 1698, Amst. 1724. — Patrum App. Opp. genuina ed. Rusel. Lond. 1746. — Patrum App. Opera ed. Hefele Tub. 1839.

Gnosis and Anti-Judaistic tendency, it may be regarded as a forerunner of the Alexandrine school. Its genuineness has been disputed, but upon insufficient grounds.[1]

2. *Hermas* (Rom. xvi. 14). Under his name is extant, and mostly in a Latin version,[2] a work in the form of allegorical visions, chiefly of a hortatory character. It is an earnest exhortation to a Christian walk and conduct, in view of the coming advent of Christ, and is entitled *Ποιμήν,* Pastor, from the Angel-Shepherd who speaks in it as the guide of men.[3] This writing was in high esteem in the second half of the 2d century (Irenaeus Adv. Haer. IV. 3), and was used in public worship. According to an ancient, but not sufficiently trustworthy, statement, the Pastor was the production of a later Hermas of Rome, the brother of the Roman bishop Pius I., about 150.

3. *Clemens Romanus,* — mentioned perhaps in Philippians iv. 3, — according to Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. III. 2, 3), and Eusebius (III. 2, 13, 15), one of the first overseers of the church at Rome, and, according to Tertullian (De praescrr. c. 32), appointed by the apostle Peter to be its teacher, seems to have died a martyr's death, according to a tradition of the 4th century preserved by Eusebius (III. 34). We have from him a long *Epistle to the Corinthian Church,* written in Greek towards the end of the first century (Dionys. Cor., in Euseb. IV. 23; and Iren. Adv. Haer. III. 3), in which, in a truly apostolic spirit, he exhorts to harmony and humility, — a letter which according to Eusebius (III. 16) was so highly esteemed as to be read in most churches in public worship. Under the title of a *Second Epistle to the Corinthians,* we have a fragment of which the authenticity is not so certain

---

[1] Its genuineness has been maintained by Henke De Ep., quae Barnabae tribuitur, authentia; Rördam Comm. de authentia, etc.; Bleeck Brief an der Hebräer, Th. I. S. 416 seq. Its spuriousness has been maintained by Ullmann (Studien I. 2, 382), Hug, Hefele, and others.

[2] A manuscript containing the original Greek has recently been found in a monastery on Mt. Athos, and has been edited by Anger. — Hermae Pastor Graecé, primum edidit Rudolphus Anger. Vol. I. — *Translator.*

[3] Gratz Disquiss. in Pastor Hermae; Jachman Der Hirte des Hermas, Respecting the doctrine of Hermas, see Dorner Person Christi.

(Euseb. III. 38), and which moreover has but little of the epistolary form. Of still less reliable authenticity are two *Circular-Epistles,* bearing Clement's name and preserved in the Syrian church, addressed particularly to male and female coelibates.

Under the highly venerated name of Clement, some productions have come down which it is certain are not his, but which merit particular mention on account of their antiquity, contents, and influence. They are:—

a. and b. An account of the manner of Clement's conversion, and of his travels in company with the Apostle Peter. This work, which is rich in the traditional materials of the early church, exists in two recensions. The first is entitled the *Clementina,* containing nineteen Greek *῾Ομιλίαι Κλήμεντος,* the substance of which belongs to the 2d century. These homilies betray a mixture of Ebionitism and Hellenistic Gnosticism, with here and there many profound Christian ideas interspersed.[1] The second recension is entitled the *Recognitiones Clementis,* *᾿Αναγνωρισμοί,* and is a modification of the homilies by a mind under the influence of the Platonic philosophy and Gnostic speculation.[2] It takes its name from the narrative, which it contains, of the meeting of Clement with his long lost father, and is extant only in the Latin version of Rufinus;

c. and d. The *Constitutiones Apostolicae, Διαταγαὶ* or *Διατάξεις ἀποστολικαί.* This is a collection of ecclesiastical statutes purporting to be the work of the Apostolic age, but in reality formed gradually in the 2d, 3d, and 4th centuries, and is of much value in reference to the history of polity, and Christian archaeology generally. The *Canones Apostolici, Κανόνες τῶν ἀποστόλων,* is a collection of 85, or according to the Occidental reception 50, short rules for church government. These, though called "Apostolical," are of even later formation than the Constitutiones, and favor the hierarchical polity, as those do the Episcopal.[3]

---

[1] Schliemann Die Clementinen; Dorner Person Christi, I. 324–350.

[2] Schliemann Die Clementinischen Recognitionen.

[3] Bruns Canones App. Krabbe Ueber den Ursprung und Inhalt der apos-

4. *Ignatius*, bishop of Antioch (Euseb. III. 36), who was carried to Rome on account of his steadfast confession of Christ, probably in the year 115, and in the following year was thrown to the lions in the Colosseum (comp. § 23, 1). There are seven *Epistles* of his extant (Iren. Adv. Haer. V. 28; Euseb. III. 36), full of Christian love and zeal, and of high value as exhibitions of the earliest polemics against the Ebionite Judaism and Docetism, and also as indicating the extreme estimate of the Episcopate which was then forming. These seven Epistles, composed on his way to a martyr's death and full of tender feeling, — five of them addressed to Asiatic churches, one to the church at Rome, and one to Polycarp, — were known for a long time only in a "longer" recension which was confessedly an interpolated one, until about the middle of the 17th century Usher edited the "shorter" and pure text in Latin, and Vossius in Greek.[1] Besides these seven, eight other Epistles have been attributed to Ignatius, which are the invention of a later day.

5. *Polycarp*, bishop of Smyrna, who was a pupil of the apostle John, and suffered martyrdom at the stake in an extreme old age, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius about the year 168 (Euseb. IV. 15, and above § 24). According to Tertullian (De praescr. c. 32), Eusebius (III. 36), and Jerome (De

---

tol. Constitutionen. Drey Neue Untersuchung über die Constitutionen und Kanones der Apostel.

[1] Pearson Vindiciae epp. S. Ignatii. Acc. Is. Vossii epp. — Dallaeus (De scriptis Dionys. Areop. et Ignatii) attacks their authenticity. Rothe (Anfänge etc. p. 715) defends it. Baur (Episcopat p. 148) contends that these Epistles are a Pauline product of the second half of the 2d century. Dorner defends their authenticity. Neander (Church History, I. 661) holds that the shorter recension itself has been very much interpolated — Until lately, the only question related to the genuineness of the longer or the shorter recension of the seven Epistles cited by Eusebius, respecting which question authorities differed; but in 1843 a Syrian manuscript was discovered containing only three of the seven (viz.: Polycarp, Ephesians, and Romans), and in a much briefer form. This manuscript has been edited by Cureton, and has led to the further position that these alone are the genuine Ignatian Epistles. This view has been supported by Lee and Bunsen. But the authority of an unknown Syriac manuscript of the 8th century is not sufficient to outweigh the great amount of testimony in favor of the substantial genuineness of the seven Ignatian Epistles, at least in the "shorter" recension.

vir. ill. s. v.), he was appointed bishop of Smyrna by the Apostle John. Of his letters, written to confirm neighboring churches and individual Christians in the faith, the *Epistle to the Church at Philippi* alone is extant (Iren. III. 3). It is entire only in the Latin version, though the greater part of the Greek original is preserved. The letter was written by Polycarp soon after the death of Ignatius, and relates to that event.

With the Apostolical Fathers is usually associated, and not without right,

6. *Papias*, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia in the first half of the 2d century, of whose work *Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις* (a collection of traditions regarding the discourses of Christ) we have only a few fragments, preserved by Eusebius and Irenaeus. According to the testimony of Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. V. 33, 4), he was a pupil of the apostle John, and the weight of this testimony is not invalidated either by the fact that Papias mingled in his belief erroneous and one-sided views, particularly a gross Chiliasm, or that with others of his time he made search after the traditionary narrations of the apostles and disciples of Christ (Euseb. III. 39). It is probable, however, that his relation to an apostle like John was only distant and somewhat indefinite. Tradition makes him to have suffered martyrdom in the reign of Marcus Aurelius (Chron. Alex. Olymp. 235, 3).

The writings which go under the name of *Dionysius Areopagita* (Acts xvii. 34),—the first bishop of Athens according to Dionys. Cor., in Euseb. III. 4; IV. 23,—are sometimes, though incorrectly, reckoned with those of the Apostolic Fathers. They are a series of productions in Greek (De hierarchia, De ecclesiastica hierarchia, De divinis nominibus, De mystica theologia, and 12 Epistolae) from the hand of a Christian Platonist, perhaps as late as four centuries after the death of Dionysius, and falsely attributed to him. (See § 105).[1]

---

[1] Engelhardt De Dionysio Areop. Plotinizante, and De origine scriptor. Areop.. Dallaeus De scriptis, quae sub. Dion. Ar. et Ignatii nominibus circumferuntur. Baumgarten-Crusius De Dion. Ar.. Vogt Neoplatonis

Justin Martyr, before his conversion a Samaritan pagan of Sichem or Flavia Neapolis in Samaria, immediately succeeds the Apostolic Fathers, and forms the link between them and the more distinct periods of the early church. The active period of his life falls within the reign of Antoninus Pius. After having, as an "evangelist" in the mantle of a philosopher, made great journeys into Egypt and Asia Minor, and taught at Rome, he suffered martyrdom (Tertull. Adv. Valentin. c. 5) during a second residence in this city, either in the reign of Antoninus Pius (as Eusebius seems to assume in his Chronicon), or more probably under Marcus Aurelius about 163 (according to Eusebius IV. 16).[1] The more immediate cause of his death was the enmity of a Cynic philosopher Crescens, whom he had attacked in his 2d apology (Tatian. Orat. contra Graec. § 19; Euseb. IV. 16). An eager seeker after truth, Justin had diligently examined various philosophical systems, finally adopting the Platonic. But the gospel alone, with which he had been made acquainted by an aged Christian, could satisfy the cravings of his mind and heart, and from this time he endeavored to exhibit partly the affinity of the better Grecian philosophies, particularly the Platonic, with the Christian system, and partly their entire insufficiency and the superiority of Christianity. He is the first church teacher in whose writings we discover a contact with Greek philosophy, and in whose mind we find Platonism permeated and transmuted by the Gospel. This is seen in his two *Apologies* (comp. § 29), and in several other less important writings (Comp. Euseb. IV. 18), — such as the *Παραινετικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας*, the rhetorical *Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας*, and the tract upon the unity of God, *Περὶ μοναρχίας*, composed chiefly of citations from the ancient Greek literature. Another principal work of Justin, the *Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo*, exhibits another tendency of his mind. In this he combats a false Jewish theology, and proves to the Jews the truth of Christianity. It is

---

mus und Christenthum. Meier Dionysii Areop. et mysticorum sec. XIV. doctrinae inter se comparantur.

[1] Semisch Justin der Märtyrer. Otto De Justini M. scriptis et doctrina.

much to be regretted that the work of Justin written in opposition to all the heretical sects of his time, and his work against Marcion, are lost. The *Epistola ad Diognetum*, usually found in the collection of Justin's works, and exhibiting in a fragmentary manner the essentials of Christianity with great fervor, could have hardly proceeded from Justin, though it is not the work of a later time than that of Justin.[1]

§ 58.

ASIA-MINOR AND NORTH-AFRICAN FATHERS.

As the theology of almost all the Apostolic Fathers had been of a practical cast, it was natural, especially on account of the misuse of speculation by the Gnostics, that in the age succeeding them this practical tendency should become the prevalent one, particularly in the Western church. It was not however until the second half of the 2d century, that the outlines of this practical and traditional theology began to be more firmly drawn; since it was not until then that in some portions of the church, particularly in the East, a speculative and theoretic tendency proceeding from the Alexandrine school began to make itself felt. The chief seats of this practical school were Asia Minor, and North Africa.

1. In the flourishing churches of *Asia Minor*, many distinguished men arose in the 2d century, who were occupied with the defence and development of Christianity in opposition to the Pagan, and with the justification of the evangelical faith and life against the Gnostic. Of these were:—

a. *Irenaeus*, a pupil of Polycarp (Iren. Ep. ad Flor., and Jerome De vir. ill.), an acquaintance of Papias (Jer. Ep. 29), the manly and firm champion of the church in the conflict with a rampant heresy,—a clear, thoughtful, philosophic mind, distinguished for his zeal in maintaining the simplicity and purity of Christian truth, for his rigorous and logical defence of the practical essentials of Christianity, for his moderation in controversies respecting unessentials (e. g. in the Easter controversy, § 38), and particularly for his silence and confession of ignorance upon points that transcend the powers of the finite understanding.[1] Irenaeus accompanied an Asia-Minor colony to Gaul, in the year 177, became bishop of the church at Lyons and Vienne after the martyr-death of Pothinus (§ 24), and about the year 202 suffered martyrdom himself, according to a tradition of the 4th century. His principal work, which is extant in an old Latin translation (though important fragments of the original Greek still remain, including nearly the whole of the first book), is his refutation of the Gnostic schemes, chiefly that of Valentinus, under the title of *Ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, Adversus Haereses*, in five books.[2] Besides this work, nothing of Irenaeus has come down except some fragments of an *Epistola ad Florinum* respecting the divine *μοναρχία* (Euseb. V. 20), in which he combats the doctrine that God is the author of sin, of an *Epistola ad Victorem* (Euseb V. 24) relating to the celebration of Easter (comp. § 38), and some other fragments.

---

[1] Grossheim De ep. ad Diognetum comm. Möhler Ueber den Brief an Diognetos. Otto De epist. ad Diog.

b. A pupil of Irenaeus (according to Photius Bibl. Cod 121) was the learned *Hippolytus*, bishop about 220, and who died a martyr about 250,—for a long time an almost unknown church father. According to a tradition of the 5th century, he was bishop of Portus Romanus; by which some have understood Aden in Western Arabia, while others have considered it identical with Ostia, being led to this conclusion by the discovery of a statue of Hippolytus in 1551 on the road to Tivoli. This latter view may now be considered as established by the recent discovery of the principal work of Hippolytus *Κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων,* which points to Rome and its vicinity as the sphere of his activity. Hippolytus was one of the most prolific authors of his time, and left writings of various kinds,—exegetical, dogmatico-polemical, chronological, and homilies, composed in Greek, of which only fragments remain.[1]

---

[1] Iren. Adv. Haer. II. 28: Quid mali est, si eorum, quae in scripturis requiruntur, quaedam quidem absolvimus secundam gratiam Dei, quaedam autem commendamus Deo, ut semper Deus doceat, homo semper discat quae sunt a Deo? . . . . Non erubescamus, quae sunt in quaestionibus majora secundam nos, reservare Deo.

[2] This work was probably undertaken in the reign of Commodus, to protect the Asia-Minor churches against the Gnostic deceptions. As a document, it strikingly evinces the tendency of Irenaeus to what is of practical importance in Christianity (Comp. Adv. Haer. II. 26 seq.; IV. 33, 8); his sound hermeneutics (II. 10; III. 5); and his reverence for Apostolical tradition in maintaining the unity of the church (I. 10, 2; III. 3, 2). Irenaeus's Chiliasm, and his belief in the continuance of extraordinary gifts in the church, are not sufficient to establish the position of *Semler* that traces of Montanism are to be found in him; for these tenets were by no means confined to the Montanists. *Walch* (Novi Commentarii) has thoroughly evinced the authenticity of this work in opposition to the doubts of Semler. See Duncker Christologie des Irenaeus, for a general view of his doctrine.

c. *Julius Africanus*, the aged friend of Origen in the first half of the 3d century, was distinguished for his theological learning. Educated, probably, in Asia Minor, he was presbyter it is supposed at Nicopolis or Emmaus in Palestine, and died about 232. He is known as the first writer of a Christian Universal History (*Χρονογραφία* in 5 books), of which only fragments remain; and also as the able critic who, in a letter preserved in Origen's Works, combats the view of Origen, that the Story of Susanna is the work of the prophet Daniel (Comp. Routh's Reliquiae Sacrae, T. II.).

2. The *North African* Church boasts of two distinguished Church Teachers.

---

[1] The manuscript of the work of Hippolytus "Against all the Heresies" was discovered in a monastery in Mt. Athos, and published as a work of Origen by Miller at Oxford in 1851, under the title of the *Φιλοσοφούμενα* of this father. The first book of this work was already extant, and published with the writings of Origen; books 4–10 are the ones recently discovered. That Origen was not the author of this work, is evident from the fact that the writer speaks of himself as a bishop, and that all the references indicate that the author was a resident in Rome or the vicinity. Bunsen (Hippolytus, and his Times), Gieseler (Studien und Kritiken, 1853), Dollinger (Hippolytus, und Kallistus), and others, ascribe the work to Hippolytus upon grounds that are conclusive, and carry most students with them. Baur (Jahrbücher 1853) contends that the author is Caius the Roman Presbyter, as does also Feszler (Tüb. theol. Quartalschr. 1852). Gieseler holds that Hippolytus was at first a Novatian bishop, though previous to the Novatian controversy he had been a Roman presbyter.

a. *Septimius Florens Tertullianus*,[1] born at Carthage about 160, died about 220, the earliest Christian Latin writer, a hero of the ancient church, and marked by grandeur even in his prejudices and biases. As a church teacher, he was distinguished for glowing piety, burning zeal for Christian truth and the spread of Christianity, comprehensive learning, acuteness and wit, energy and depth of intellect, and also for a fancy and vehemence not sufficiently regulated by reason, together with a gloomy earnestness. Previous to his conversion he was probably a rhetorician and advocate (Comp. Euseb. II. 2; and the fragments of a Tertullianus in the Pandects); afterwards he was a presbyter at Carthage, and perhaps resided at Rome for a time; and, about 201, he went over to Montanism, enlisting as was his wont all his energies in this scheme, though at a later day, as it would appear, inclining again more to the Catholic church. The *Writings*[2] of Tertullian are a most important source of information respecting Christian Antiquity, being a mine of dogmatico-historical and archaeological materials. They are important as exerting a very great influence upon the formation of the terminology of the Western church, though they are full of African provincialisms and legal terms, and rugged, from the endeavor of this profound and fiery mind to find in the rude Punic Latin concise and significant words for the new and great ideas of Christianity. Tertullian's writings refer partly to the relations which the Christians sustained to the heathen, and their situation under persecution; partly to matters of Christian and ecclesiastical life generally; and partly to doctrinal and polemical subjects. To the *first class* belong, of the Non-Montanistic treatises, the *Exhortatio ad martyres* (*designatos*), the *Apologeticus* (§ 29), *Ad nationes* (§ 29), *De testimonio animae* (§ 29), *De*

---

[1] Neander Antignosticus: The Spirit of Tertullian. Rudelbach Reformation, Lutherthum, und Union, S. 645 seq. Kaye Tertullian and his writings.

[2] Noesselt Diss. III. de vera aetate scriptor. Tertull. — The best editions of Tertullian's Works are those of Rigaltius. Par. 1635. 2 voll. fol., and of Priorius. Par. 1664. fol — Hand-editions are those of Semler in 6 voll., with an Index Latinitatis Tertullianae by Schütz and Windorf; and of Gersdorf Bibliotheca patr. eccl. Lat. selecta P. IV. V.

spectaculis (teaching that to visit them is unchristian), and *De idolatria* (showing that no participation of any sort in pagan customs is allowable); and, of the Montanistic treatises, *De corona militis* (affirming that the soldier's coronation upon the celebration of a victory, and such like customs, was pagan and anti-Christian), *De fuga in persecutione* (comp. § 55), *Scorpiace adversus gnosticos* (combatting the sophistry by which the Gnostics would justify the denial of Christ in words and acts), and the apologetic tract addressed to the President *Scapula*. To the *second class* belong, of the Non-Montanistic writings, *De patientia*, *De oratione*, *De baptismo* (defending the external rite in opposition to the Caïanians a Gnosticising mystic sect), *De poenitentia*, *Ad uxorem* (containing advice and counsel to be followed by his wife after his own decease), *De habitu muliebri* and *De cultu feminarum* (treating of the mode of dress proper for Christian females); and, of the Montanistic writings, *De exhortatione castitatis* (dissuading from second marriage), *De monogamia*, *De pudicitia* (exhibiting the Montanistic principles respecting the penance and absolution of those excommunicated for unchastity), *De jejunio adversus Psychicos*, *De virginibus velandis* (in public worship), and *De pallio* (concerning wearing the philosopher's cloak after confession of Christianity). To the *third class*, belong, of the Non-Montanistic writings, *De praescriptionibus adversus haereticos* (an argument for denying to all heretics the right of bringing a complaint, as in the instance of an accused party; the argument being deduced from the uniformity of the doctrine coming down from the Ecclesia Apostolica); and of the Montanistic writings, the tracts *Adversus Marcionem*, *Adversus Valentinianos*, *De carne Christi* (anti-Docetic), *De resurrectione carnis* (combatting the Gnostic denial of the doctrine), *Adversus Hermogenem*, *De anima* (a criticism upon the philosophical and heretical questions respecting the nature of the soul), *Adversus Praxeam*, and the apologetic tract *Adversos Judaeos*. The tract of Tertullian against Hermogenes (*De censu animae*,—upon the nature of the soul, asserting its original kindredness to God and its natural immortality), together with the defence of Chiliasm in the work *De spe fidelium*, of Hades as a middle state in the tract *De paradiso*, and of the Montanistic doctrine of the prophetic ecstasy, is not extant.

b. *Thascius Caecilius Cyprianus*, a very distinguished teacher of rhetoric at Carthage until he had passed the meridian of life; converted to Christianity about 245, he became an ardent admirer of the writings of Tertullian, was soon appointed a presbyter in the church, and after the year 248 was the bishop of the church at Carthage by the choice of the congregation.[1] He was particularly distinguished by his hearty and intense attachment to the *visible* church, as well as for his Christian wisdom and energy in the discharge of his episcopal duties, — a model of pastoral and Catholic zeal in word and deed. This zeal for the preservation of the order and unity of the church, and for the promotion of its welfare in every way, he manifested as well in the midst of outward persecutions under Decius, Gallus, and Valerian (§ 26), as in the internal conflict with Felicissimus and his party (§ 34, 1), while at the same time he did not lose sight of the welfare of other churches than his own. In the general concerns of the church, as for example in the settlement of the Novatian controversy (§ 34, 2), he took an active part, and highly as he revered the Roman See (§ 32) did not hesitate openly to oppose the Romish bishop in the controversy respecting the baptism of heretics (§ 39, 32). The *Writings* of Cyprian are closely connected with his active labors. Next to his famous work *De unitate ecclesiae* (§ 32), the collection of his *Epistolae*, 83 in number, is of the highest value for the church history of that period. Of these, the beautiful *Epistola ad Donatum de conversione sua* furnishes a striking description of the effects of conversion, and a comparison of the life of a Christian with that of the pagan. The remaining undoubtedly genuine writings of Cyprian are the following: the tract *De idolorum vanitate*, composed soon after his conversion, in which he follows for the most part Tertullian's Apologeticus and Minucius Felix; the *Libri tres testimoniorum* written while he was presbyter,—a collection of Scripture texts proving, in the 1st book, that the Christians and not the Jews are now the people of God, in the 2d, giving a brief statement of the Christian creed, and in the 3d, of the system of Christian ethics (a work very valuable as exhibiting the then prevalent mode of citing Scripture passages, and indicating the relative importance attached to the several doctrines of Christianity); the treatise *De habitu virginum; Sermo de lapsis* (§ 34); *De bono patientiae*,—an exhortation to Christian moderation and patience in controversy, occasioned by his dispute with Stephen of Rome respecting the baptism of heretics; *De zelo et livore*,—composed upon the same occasion with the preceding; the tract *Ad Demetrianum*,—a defence of Christianity against the charge that it was the cause of the then prevailing pestilence, and of all the evils the Empire was suffering; *De mortalitate*,—written for the same purpose as the preceding; *De opere et eleemosynis*,—an exhortation to benevolence, with high praise of *works* as such; *De oratione domirica*,—an exposition of the Lord's prayer; and the *Exhortatio ad martyrium.* Cyprian, after exile, suffered martyrdom by the sword, Sept. 14th, 258 (§ 26).

---

[1] Huther Cyprians Lehre von der Kirche Rettberg Cyprianus. Pearson Annales Cyprianici. Cyprian's life has been written by his deacon Pontius.

§ 59.

THE ALEXANDRINE AND ORIGENISTIC SCHOOL.

Michaelis Exercitatio de scholae Alexandrinae origine. Matter Essai hist. sur l' ecole d' Alexandrie. Guericke De schola Alexandrina. Hasselbach De schola Alexandrina. Redepenning Origines. Ritter Geschichte der Christl. Philosophie, I. 421 seq. Thomasius Origines. Dorner Person Christi, I. 635–768, 945–1019. Baur Dreieinigkeitslehre, I. 186–243. Kaye Clement of Alexandria.

Antithetic to the practical tendency in the theologizing of the church, there was formed at *Alexandria* a speculative scientific school, upon the foundation, at first, of a simple

Catechetical Institute. Inasmuch as the Catechists in the Alexandrine church were frequently called upon to enunciate and defend the doctrines of Christianity before cultivated Greeks, it was necessary that they should themselves be scientifically educated men. Hence it was natural that such teachers would not confine themselves merely to the preparation of Catechumens for baptism, but would also seek to furnish a scientific Christian education to young men of cultivation, in order that they might be fitted to teach Christianity to others. In this manner there arose at Alexandria, where there was already a very flourishing pagan school, a sort of *Theological Seminary*, which, growing up under the influence of Alexandrine culture, has perpetuated its memory in the series of distinguished minds who stood at its head from the middle of the 2d to the end of the 4th century. Eusebius (V. 10),—who designates the institution as a *διδασκαλεῖον τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων*, or as *τὸ τῆς κατηχήσεως διδασκαλεῖον* (V. 10; VI. 3, 26),—derives the Alexandrine school *ἐξ ἀρχαίου ἔϑους*, and mentions *Pantaenus* as the first distinguished teacher in it; but the presbyter *Philippus Sidetes* about the year 420 (Socrates H. E. VII. 26, 27), a pupil of Rhodon the last president of the Alexandrine school, in a fragment of his *῾Ιστορια Χριστιανική*, names *Athenagoras* as its founder. This statement, however, is very uncertain, among other reasons, from the fact that this fragment of Philippus is itself of doubtful character, and contains some other statements that are demonstrably false. The only heads of the Alexandrine school who can be designated with entire certainty are the following: in the 2d century, *Pantaenus* and *Clement;* in the 3d century, *Origen*, *Heraclas*, and *Dionysius;* and in the 4th century, *Didymus* (§ 85); with some probability also may be mentioned, in the 3d century, after Dionysius, *Pierius*, *Theognostus* and, *Peter Martyr,* and in the 4th century, before Didymus, *Arius*, and after Didymus, *Rhodon.* By the close of the 4th century, owing to the distracted condition of the Alexandrine church, the Alexandrine scientific school came to an end, and only the catechetical institute remained.

2. The Alexandrine school, from its first formation, was distinguished for a peculiar *scientific tendency in theology.* While the church very generally contented itself with a simple and decided rejection of all Gnosticism, the Alexandrine theologians sought to distinguish what was true from what was false in this scheme, and, while avoiding the erroneous substance of the heretical Gnosis, to make use of its formal science, in enunciating and establishing the system of Christian doctrine. Their ideal of Christian theology, as Clement[1] expresses it and Origen repeats it after him, was a *γνῶσις ἀληϑινή, ἐκκλησιαστική,*[2] — a living Christian cognition, grounded in Christian faith and *intrinsically* attainable by every Christian, in which Faith and Science interpenetrate each other.[3] This their *Christian* Gnosis, which they professed to derive from a private theological tradition coming down from Christ and the four chief apostles,[4] they opposed to the *γνῶσις ψευδώνυμος* of the heretical Gnostics, as well as to a philosophy not animated by the spirit of Christianity. They opposed it, moreover, to that simple *πίστις* which fears and despises all philosophic investigation, — a *πίστις ἄλογος καὶ ἰδιοτική* which needs to be compacted and cleared up into a *πίστις γνωστική.*[5] In this latter direction, following their

---

[1] Comp. Neander De fidei gnoseosque ideae ratione, secundum mentem Clem. Alex. Daehne De *γνῶσει* Clem. Alex. Baur (Ueber Clemens als Gnostiker) Gnosis. S. 502–543. Guericke De schola etc. P. II. p. 106–124. Redepenning Origines, S. 83–183.

[2] The Gnosis of a *τῷ ὄντι κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα γνωστικός* (Clem. Strom. VII. p. 584 seq.; II. 457, ed. Potter).

[3] *Ἡ γνῶσις ἀπόδειξις τῶν διὰ πίστεως παρειλημμένων ἰσχυρὰ καὶ βέβαιος διὰ τῆς κυριακῆς διδασκαλίας ἐποικοδομουμένη τῇ πίστει, εἰς τὸ ἀμετάπτωτον καὶ μετ' ἐπιστήμης καὶ καταληπτὸν παραπέμπουσα* — Clem. Strom. VII. p. 865, ed. Potter. Compare also Stromata II. 373, 380; II. 519, 529; VI. 691; VII. 731, Ed. Sylburg.

[4] Comp. Clem. Strom. I. p. 322 seq., and VI. 771, 802 seq., Ed. Potter; also Eusebius II. 1; also Origen C. Cels. VI. 6, p. 633 seq.

[5] The Alexandrine theologians claimed that their Gnosis was the scientific apprehension of the church doctrine, and hence *γνῶσις ἐκκλησιαστική*. At the same time they did not, as did the other church fathers, confine the idea of a divine education of man to the Jewish nation. Acknowledging, with the church generally, that Judaism was a preparation for Christianity, the Alexandrine also contended that the better pagan philosophers were likewise the instruments of God in this same respect, and hence they regarded philosophy generally, as well as

intense and somewhat narrow bias towards the Platonic philosophy, they certainly did not altogether escape the pride of speculation, and the hazard of radically transforming the church creed even in some of its fundamentals, by applying to it the idealizing principles of their philosophical system, which they assumed to be the ideas of the absolute reason (§ 40).

3. *Pantaenus*, a converted pagan philosopher, contributed to the first formation of this particular tendency of the Alexandrine school. According to some accounts he was a Stoic previous to his conversion, but there is little doubt that he was a Platonic Eclectic. During the second half of the 2d century he undertook his great missionary journey (§ 18), and from the year 180 discharged the office of catechist at Alexandria (Euseb. V. 9, 10). He wrote several commentaries upon Scripture, but none of his productions have come down to us, and we can form an estimate of him only in connection with his pupil Clemens Alexandrinus.

Titus Flavius Clemens[1] of Athens or Alexandria (Epiphan. Haer. XXVII. 6), converted late in life (Clem. Paedag. II. c. 8), a man of talent though by no means a systematic thinker, possessing extensive knowledge which was entirely consecrated to the service of Christ, although the deepest and simplest form of humility does not appear in his character, discharged the office of a catechist and presbyter at Alexandria towards the end of the 2d and in the beginning of the 3d century (Euseb. V. 11; VI. 6, 13, 14; Jerome De vir. ill. c. 38), — after having previously exhausted all opportunities for acquiring Grecian and Christian culture in his frequent journeyings, and finally receiving the instructions of Pantaenus (Clem. Strom. I. p. 247). In the persecution under Severus in 202 he fled (Comp. Euseb. VI. 3), and remained a long time

---

the Old-Testament revelation, as the providential antecedent to Christianity. Their endeavor to harmonize all these Pagan, Jewish, and Christian elements in one system, thereby finding the true εὐαγγέλιον πνευματικόν, led, as we shall see in examining the views of Origen, to much that was arbitrary and one-sided, both in Hermeneutics and Dogmatics.

[1] Comp. De Groot Diss. de Clemente Alex. . Guericke De schola Alex. P. I. p. 30; P. II. p. 106—165, etc. Kaye Clement of Alexandria.

in Jerusalem, Antioch, and Cappadocia, occupied with ecclesiastical duties and philosophical studies. Whether, and when, he returned to Alexandria is uncertain. He died between 212 and 220. We have from him three productions, in particular, which constitute one great work,—systematic as a whole, but unsystematic as to its parts and details. It portrays Christ as the divine Educator of man,—a favorite idea with Clement. This ϑεῖος παιδαγωγός, he first represents as conducting man, sunken in superstition, to faith,—in his apologetic work *Λόγος προτρεπτίκος, Cohortatio ad gentes* (§ 29), which exhibits the worthlessness of the heathen mythology, and the insufficiency of philosophic systems, together with single profound thoughts upon the nature of Christianity. Christ is next represented as purifying the believer by moral discipline,—in Clement's ethical tract *Paedagogus*, which contains particular maxims for a Christian life and walk. Lastly the Great Teacher is represented as conducting the believer, thus morally purified, to a profounder knowledge of Christianity,—in the incomplete work entitled *Stromata* from the variety and disconnection of its contents (§ 29). This is a learned composition, made up of materials drawn from the ancient Greek and Christian literatures, and intended to furnish the ideal of a genuine Christian theology or Gnosis. Besides these, we have from Clement the somewhat more systematic work *Τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος; Quis dives salvetur?* (Euseb. III. 23),—written to show the true Christian use of wealth, and to check the growing asceticism in the church. An important work of Clement, *Ὑποτυπώσεις*, containing a commentary upon a great part of the Old and New Testaments, is lost. Owing to its frequent approximations to heresy it gave much offence. Perhaps extracts from this work are to be found in the *Adumbrationes* upon several of the Catholic Epistles (still extant in Latin), and in the *Ἐκλογαὶ ἐκ τῶν προφητικῶν.* An Anti-Gnostic work of Clement upon the doctrine of the one First Principle, and an Anti-Montanistic work *Περὶ προφητείας*, are both lost.

4. The successor of Clement, in the Alexandrine school.

was *Origen*[1] (See Euseb. VI. 1—6, 8, 14—21, 23—28, 30—33, 36—39; VII. 1; Jerome De vir. ill. c. 54), also called *Adamantius* by the ancients, probably on account of his iron industry, — the most learned and stimulating, and in all respects one of the most distinguished, of the primitive fathers, and one who has exerted an abiding influence upon the history of theology. Born at Alexandria about 185, having received a literary and Christian education from his father *Leonidas*, and also the teaching of Clement, he was able while yet almost a mere child to minister courage to his dying father, whose martyr-death he was himself eager to imitate. A youth of eighteen, he supported his mother and his six younger orphan-brothers, chiefly by his philological labors. At this early age, highly esteemed and beloved by the Christians and particularly by the martyrs, both persecuted and admired by the pagans, and feared by the heretics, he was deemed worthy of the catechist's office and appointed to it by bishop *Demetrius* in 203. Some time later than this, in his zeal to make an entire consecration of himself to God, and misled by a stricter asceticism than he afterwards approved of, he practised upon himself the literal interpretation of the passage in Matthew xix. 12. While a catechist, Origen became an attendant upon the lectures of the New-Platonic *Ammonius Saccas*, and now an earnest study of philosophy both inclined and enabled him to seek and find traces of truth in all sects, and thus to make himself a guide to Christ for men of the most diverse character and culture, — Christians as well as Pagans. Leaving the instruction of the catechumens to an assistant, he now sought to conduct his numerous pupils through the whole domain of Grecian culture to a spiritual understanding of the Scriptures, and to Christian Science. His labors were instrumental in bringing back heretics of all sorts, — e. g. the Gnostic *Ambrosius* afterwards so dear to him, — into the church. He did not confine his labors to Alexandria. In the reign of Caracalla he visited

---

[1] Redepenning Origines. Thomasius Origines.

Rome, and, upon invitation, Arabia also (§ 18, 1). During this same reign, in the year 215, he fled from a violent persecution into Palestine, in order, as he says (T. VI. in Joh. c. 24), to seek out the footsteps of Jesus and his disciples and the prophets. In the reign of Severus, the mother of the emperor invited him to Antioch (§ 25). The bishop Demetrius at first honored the zeal and brilliant success with which Origen discharged the duties of his office; but believing that his own episcopal authority had been trenched upon, by the act of consecration by which two foreign bishops, *Theoctistus* of Caesarea and *Alexander* of Jerusalem, had inducted Origen into the presbyter's office while upon a journey undertaken about 228 in reference to some ecclesiastical affairs, his excited hierarchical temper readily seized upon an accusation, which had already been made against Origen in several quarters, and which certainly was not unfounded,—viz.: that Origen had corrupted Christian doctrine by some false and arbitrary speculations in his work *De Principiis*,—and upon the strength of it sought to remove him from Alexandria. An Alexandrine Synod in 231 (Phot. Bibl. cod. 118) forbade Origen to teach or reside in Alexandria; a second synod in 232 deposed him from the presbyter's office, and excommunicated him. He now betook himself, pursued by the accusations of Demetrius, to Caesarea in Palestine. Here he found a friendly reception, even from the emperor Philip himself, and continued to labor as he had at Alexandria, so that traces of the scientific spirit awakened by him were still plainly apparent in the 4th century. Here he also cultivated a new and different soil, from which, after his death, the church reaped a scientific benefit that for a long time weakened and neutralized the opposition which individuals here and there continued to make to his views. During this period in his life, he was repeatedly invited to sit in council with Arabian synods against heretics; in 244 against Beryl (§ 56), and in 248 against a sect that asserted that the soul would die with the body and be awakened again. In both of these instances he succeeded in convincing the heretic,—a success enjoyed but by very few in the history of the church. Origen with drew into Cappadocia from the persecution under Maximin the Thracian; but in the Decian persecution he suffered so much from mal-treatment, when refusing to recant under torture, that he died a few years after at Tyre, in 254.

The *Writings of Origen* are partly dogmatical and dogmatico-apologetical, and partly exegetical and exegetico-critical.

To the first class, the *Dogmatical* and *Dogmatico-Apologetical*, belongs the work in four books *Περὶ ἀρχῶν, De Principiis* (sc. *rerum*, or, less probably, *fidei*), written about 225. It is the first attempt at a systematic development of the Christian creed, and, with the exception of several large fragments in Greek (half of the 3d, and the most of the 4th book), is known only in the imperfect Latin version of Rufinus. The highly valuable work *Contra Celsum* (§ 29) in eight books, written in the year 247 (Euseb. VI. 36) at the request of Origen's friend Ambrosius, also belongs to this class. The *Stromata*, which like the De Principiis belongs to the earlier part of Origen's life, is lost. In writings of this sort, and particularly in the immature conclusions of the De Principiis, Origen was certainly too much ruled by his speculative and idealizing tendency; although he ever cherishes a reverence for divine things, and recommends prayer in connection with the diligent study of the Scriptures (Epist. ad Gregor. Thaum. c. 3), in order to their apprehension. He was led to develop more particularly the fundamental principles of his speculative system, for which Clement had prepared the way, in his endeavor to spiritualize the church doctrines, and defend them against the objections of the Greek philosophers, and of the Gnostics. Hence he sought to remove from the doctrine of God all that appeared to him to be Anthropomorphism, and examined with great care and metaphysical acumen the idea of God as a Spirit. This, in his system, is God in the full sense, *αὐτόθεος*, the Father; whose perfect image and reflection is the divine Logos; subordinate to whom, is the eternal and hypostatic revelation of God in the Holy Spirit.[1] Creation from nothing, Origen held in common with the church (§ 53); though he intended by this only that God's will and power is the ground of all existence, and that creation is not conditioned by a pre-existing material. On the other hand, Origen deviated from the church doctrine in denying a beginning in time to creation; contending that it is impossible to conceive of a beginning of activity and of imparting love, in God. In this latter statement, however, he transferred to the created universe what is true only in relation to the second uncreated hypostasis in the divine Essence,—viz.: that God must *necessarily*, and *from eternity*, put forth a self-imparting activity, and exercise a self-imparting love. In like manner, in seeking to spiritualize everything in the highest degree, he modified the church doctrine of the resurrection (Comp. the fragments of his work *De resurrectione*), and rejected every form of the doctrine of the millennial reign (§ 55). Origen's Theodicy constituted the centre-point of his whole speculative system. The assumption of an original difference in the capacities and powers of rational beings was contradictory, he supposed, to the divine justice and love. There was rather, he said, a definite and fixed number of spiritual beings produced by God from eternity,—a fixed number, because, in Origen's opinion, no conscious mind, not even that of God, could take in an endless series; and produced from eternity, because the activity of the divine love has no commencement. All these spirits were originally equally akin to God, and had equal endowments; but when, in the exercise of free will, they removed themselves in differing degrees from God,—who alone is good in himself, and in whose communion alone created spirits can be good,—this difference in the degree of moral estrangement and enmity, which varies with the intensity or the laxity of self-will in each particular spirit, brought in, as a remedial punishment, a corresponding variety in the capacity, condition, and relations of each. One consequence of this fall of pre-existent spirits was the creation, for purposes of discipline only, of the material corporeal world,—in which, the apostate creature no longer fit for a pure spiritual existence, and each one in the position suited to him (according to the De Principiis, the most deeply fallen were put into brute bodies, though Origen afterwards renounced this), should toil upward once more, in continual conflict with alien and hostile elements. The issue at which the course of the present world aims, is the re-union of fallen spirits with God, ἀποκατάστασις, the cessation of all evil and of all punishment. The agent of this redemption is Christ, — the Logos born a man, through the medium of a pre-existent individual soul that has become like himself through his own transforming power, — who extends his redemptive influence over all species of fallen beings, and who consequently (according to the De Principiis) must suffer for fallen spirits in the various realms and gradations of spiritual existence. But when, through this Apocatastasis, evil has become entirely extinct in this aera or stadium in the history of creation, it will again break forth in some future period, and occasion new institutes and economies of God in order to its suppression; and thus the history of the universe from everlasting to everlasting is that of alternate apostasy and recovery.

---

[1] The passages from Origen, teaching a Trinity of three eternal divine personalities of differing dignity, are collected in Guericke Comm de schola Alex P. II. p. 197—211.

The Anthropology of Origen, and of the Alexandrine school in general, may be regarded as the precursor of the Pelagian theory. Although in the first three centuries it was acknowledged upon all sides that human nature is no longer in its original condition, and that its primitive likeness to God has been injured in consequence of the first sin, yet as early as the first half of the 3d century the germs of two opposite tendencies began to appear, — the *North-African*, which laid stress principally upon the corruption of human nature, and the necessity of its change by divine grace; and the *Alexandrine*, which laid it upon man's free self-determination. *Clement's* opposition to Gnosticism, and the Gnostic assertion of man's subjection to the dominion of the Hyle by a power above and out of himself, carried him to assert the inalienable freedom of man in such a manner that the doctrine of human corruption almost disappears, or at best becomes merely the doctrine of human imperfection. *Origen* is very earnest in asserting a corruption of human nature, but only in so far as he sees in man a being who fell in a pre-existent celestial state. The doctrine of free will was naturally a fundamental one in his system, as accounting for the difference in the degrees of corruption among mankind; while at the same time his assertion that communion with God is the only source of good in the creature, would logically render the doctrine of grace and spiritual influences a necessary one for him.

The *Exegetical Writings* of Origen consist, partly of brief Scholia, Σημειώσεις; partly, of Commentaries or *Τόμοι*, principally upon the New Testament, — viz. upon the Gospels of Matthew and John, and the Epistle to the Romans; and partly, practical expositions, Homilies, upon nearly the whole Old Testament, some of which are extant, though only in a Latin version. Origen proceeded, at least in the mature period of his life, from the hermeneutical principle,[1] — which Clement had followed though with less rigor and consistency, — that it is the highest aim of exegesis *to penetrate into the spirit of Scripture*, and discover those vivifying ground-truths of revelation from which all others receive their life and light; and that the necessary means to this is a communion of spirit with the Redeemer, who is the soul of the Scriptures. But Origen failed to realize his idea of a perfect exegesis. It is true that he by no means neglected the media to the literal understanding of the written word; on the contrary he applied himself most industriously to the study of the letter, learned Hebrew in middle life, and is to be regarded as the father of learned and scientific exegesis. But instead of deriving the spirit from the letter, he used this latter, frequently, as the veil of ideas altogether foreign to revelation. As in man he distinguished, in accordance with the Platonic trichotomy, *σῶμα*, *ψυχή*, and *πνεῦμα*, so in Scripture he distinguished a three-fold sense, — a literal, moral, and mystical. The first gives the meaning of the letter, the second gives the moral application, the third yields the highest speculative truth, and relates to God and the world of spirits. This latter sense or meaning (as the *εὐαγγέλιον πνευματικόν,* in distinction from the *εὐαγγέλιον αἰσϑητον*) is apprehensible only through a spiritual communion with Christ, — only by the *πνευματικῶς χριστιανίζοντες,* the *γνωστικοί* of Clement. Origen on the whole endeavored to retain the truth of the letter, in his exegesis; yet he found much, particularly in the Old Testament, of which however he regarded Christ to be the animating soul, which he could not reconcile with his philosophical ideas, and in all such cases he supposed the letter must be given up, and that it was a merely mythical costume employed by God in order to incite man to search for the deeper meaning. He sometimes applied this principle of interpretation even to the New Testament and its historical facts; and if this was not done, he too often left the simple literal meaning of the New Testament narrative, in order to obtain what he supposed was a higher sense, but what was in reality a shallow and oftentimes an absurd one.[1] By such allegorizing, different as it was from the unlimited arbitrariness of the Gnostics, and notwithstanding the deep reverence which Origen cherished for the Scriptures, the way was unavoidably prepared for an arbitrary interpretation of the Bible, and a thoroughly corrupting idealism in religion.

---

[1] **Guericke** De schola Alex. P. II. p. 57–81. **Hagenbach** Obss. circa Origenis methodum interpretandae.

The *Exegetico-Critical Works* of Origen, to which belongs his *Epistola ad Africanum* written about 240 respecting the Story of Susanna (§ 58, 1, c), consist principally of his great work upon the Old Testament, the *Hexapla,* which he completed in Cappadocia during the reign of Maximin, after a labor upon it of twenty-seven years. It was undertaken chiefly to aid in the controversy between Christianity and Judaism. In this work Origen sets down, in six columns, the Hebrew text of the Old Testament in both Hebrew and Greek letters, next the Greek version of Aquila and that of Symmachus, lastly the Septuagint Alexandrine version and that of Theodotion (the last four alone are sometimes called the *Tetrapla*, Euseb. VI. 16). To these, he added two or three old Greek translations of some portions of the Canon (hence the work is sometimes called the *Octapla*, *Enneapla*), and designated upon the margin, by the obelus and asterisk, the places where the Septuagint version contains either more or less than the Hebrew text.[1] Origen also labored diligently upon the text of the New Testament, but the result of his labors has been lost.

---

[1] For example, in T. XV. in Matth. c. 14, he refers the language in Matt. xx. 6, 7, to the pre-existence of human souls.

Besides the above-mentioned writings, we have from Origen the two brief practical tracts *De oratione* and *Exhortatio ad martyrium*. The first was composed about 233, to show the necessity and use of prayer, in opposition to the views of a mystic sect of the Gnostics, and contains an exposition of the Lord's prayer; the second tract was written in the reign of Maximin for the encouragement of two of Origen's friends, who were undergoing sufferings on account of their Christian confession, and is a spirited assertion of the duty of an open oral confession, in opposition to the pagan sophistries upon this point.[2]

5. Origen himself had been compelled by his enemies to leave Alexandria, but the influence proceeding from him was too profound to be stopped at Alexandria by his banishment, or at Caesarea by his death. The *Origenistic School* continued to flourish as well in Alexandria, as in Caesarea.

The *Alexandrine School* continued to flourish anew, under the mild, prudent, and peace-loving *Dionysius Alexandrinus* (see Euseb. VI. 29, 35, 40 sqq. 44 sqq.; VII. 1, 4 sqq., 20 sqq.; Jer. De vir. ill. c. 69), since 233 a teacher in the school, since 248 bishop of Alexandria, and who died in 265 after enduring many sufferings in the Decian and Valerian persecutions, amidst which he did not cease to care for his own flock and the church generally (Euseb. VI. 40; VII. 11). At home as well as abroad he showed his Christian wisdom and moderation. He exhibited great skill in settling the discussion which had arisen in his diocese respecting Chiliasm (§ 55), and afterwards wrote upon this subject his work *Περὶ ἐπαγγελιῶν* (upon the divine promises). When Novatian applied to him for support, he declared against him, though with great mildness (Euseb. VI. 45; comp. § 34). In the controversy concerning the baptism of heretics (§ 39), though not neutral in his opinions he yet endeavored to bring about agreement by moderation towards both parties. In opposition to Sabellius, he definitely asserted the personal distinction between the Father and the Son, following the lead of Origen who himself did not distinguish between *ἑτερότης οὐσίας* and *ἑτερότης ὑποστάσεως*. But in his polemics Dionysius went even farther than his teacher, and separated the divine hypostases, even in reference to the predicate of eternity, so sharply from each other, that his mode of expression justly seemed to others, and particularly to the contemporaneous bishop *Dionysius of Rome*, to be incompatible with the true deity of Christ.[1] Dionysius of Alexandria did not deem it beneath him to accept the rule and test of ecclesiastical orthodoxy from his fellow bishop of Rome, and by an explanatory tract (*Ἔλεγχος καὶ Ἀπολογία*),[2] in which he retracted the offensive phraseology, prevented the outbreak of a controversy (see Athanas. De sententia Dionysii). Towards the close of his life he found occasion to declare his opposition to the views of Paul of Samosata (Euseb. VII. 27). Of the many writings of Dionysius, partly dogmatical and dogmatico-polemical, partly exegetical, together with letters (quoted often in Euseb. VI. VII.), there are only fragments extant.

---

[1] On account of its great size, a new copy of the entire Hexapla was never made. The original remained in Tyre till into the 4th century, when it was taken to Caesarea. It seems to have perished in the 7th century during the Saracenic invasion. The few fragments that remain have been collected by Montfaucon. The loss of Origen's critical investigations is the severest that has befallen the department of Biblical Science.

[2] The best edition of the works of Origen is the Benedictine edition of La Rue. Par. 1733 seq. 4 voll. fol. It includes also the ungenuine work Contra Marcionitas, and the Philosophumena: cum vita auctoris et multis dissertationibus. La Rue's edition has been reprinted by Lommatzsch, Berlin, in 26 vols. 8vo.

---

[1] Dionysius of Alex. had made use of strictly Arian phrases in describing Christ (*ποίημα καὶ γενητός, ξένος κατ' οὐσίαν τοῦ πατρός, ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*, etc.). See the passages in Guericke De Schóla Alex. P. II. p. 315. Comp. § 56.

[2] Routh Reliquiae Sacrae III. 194.

To the *School of Origen at Caesarea*, there belonged in the 3d century two noteworthy men. The first, is *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, properly *Theodorus*, who came a pagan youth to Caesarea, in order to attend the neighboring law-school at Berytus, but was entirely carried away with admiration of Origen, embraced Christianity, and began the study of theology with great zeal. He was made bishop of Neo-Caesarea about 244, and became distinguished by his successful labors in spreading Christianity, and also by his writings, of which only two or three have come down to us. He died in 270.

The second, is the presbyter *Pamphilus* of Caesarea, who established a celebrated library in this city, or rather made essential additions to that which Origen had already collected, labored zealously in multiplying and distributing copies of the Scriptures particularly among the laity, and composed, besides many commentaries on the Old Testament now lost, a defence of Origen, *Apologia pro Origine*, in five books, to which his friend Eusebius added a sixth. He suffered martyrdom in 309.

This series of distinguished pupils and admirers of Origen naturally called out more or less of opposition to what was peculiar and uncatholic in his system. But this opposition showed itself in a wavering manner, and was often accompanied with personal and extreme feeling, until *Methodius*, bishop of Olympus and afterwards of Tyre, appeared as the declared opponent of Origen and his school. He attacked Origen's doctrine of world-evolutions and theory of the resurrection, in his treatises *Περὶ ἀναστάσεως* and *Περὶ τῶν γενητῶν*, — harbingers of yet more earnest attacks. Methodius died probably about 310 as a martyr. Fragments of his writings are found in Epiphan. Haer. 64, and Phot. Cod. 235, 236.

§ 60.

THE ANTIOCHIAN SCHOOL.

Münter Comm. de schola Antiochena.

At the close of this period, the germ of another theological school began to appear, which however did not obtain its full expansion till the 4th century. This was the *School at Antioch*, founded at the end of the 3d century by the learned presbyter *Dorotheus* (Euseb. VII. 32), and *Lucian* a distinguished critic upon the Old and New Testaments (Jer. Catal s. v.), who suffered martyrdom in 312 at Nicomedia (Euseb IX. 6). This school adopted the principles of a grammatico-historical exegesis in opposition to all allegorizing, and was marked by a learned and grammatical sobriety of judgment; but became also the fruitful source of an uneradicable narrowness and shallowness in Biblical interpretation. (See §§ 81, 87.)

SECOND PERIOD: A. D. 311—590.

SECTION FIRST.

The Spread and Limitation of Christianity.

CHAPTER FIRST.

CHRISTIANITY WITHIN THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

Hoffmann Ruina superstitionis paganae. Tzschirner Der Fall des Heidenthum. Beugnot Histoire de la destruction du Paganisme en Occident.

§ 61.

THE CHURCH UNDER CONSTANTINE AND CONSTANTIUS.[1]

By the edict of *Galerius*, who died in 311, an unwelcome check had been given to the violent measures against the Christians of *Maximin*,[2] — the only one of the rulers of the Roman Empire who was now a vehement enemy of Christianity. It is indeed true, that soon after this edict this emperor granted a request, which he himself had prompted, made by several important cities, that the Christians should be excluded from within the walls, and published this decision upon iron tablets fastened to pillars (Euseb. IX. 7, 9); he again refused the Christians leave to build churches, forbade their assembling in private, punished confessors severely in body and estate, even putting some individuals to death (Euseb. IX. 6), and employed various artifices, — such as publishing under imperial sanction the most shameful calumnies against the Christians, — to bring paganism again into repute. Maximin even went so far as to require the so-called Acta Pilati,[1] — a pretended account of Christ by Pilate containing the most malignant blasphemy, — to be studied and committed to memory in the public schools (Euseb. IX. 5). But these machinations of the emperor failed of their intent from two causes. In the first place, Maximin's part of the empire, — as if the Supreme Judge had come visibly to express his condemnation, — was desolated by famine, pestilence, and war, amidst which calamities the self-denial and compassion of the Christians were exhibited in an eminent degree (Euseb. IX. 8); and in the second place, an emperor had now appeared in the West, through whose instrumentality the Christian church came to occupy a new position throughout the whole Roman world.

---

[1] Compare: Eusebius Hist. Eccl. IX. X. and De vita Constantini. Gibbon Decline and Fall, XIV—XX. Mosheim Commentaries, Cent. IV. § 6, 7.

[2] A man, it is noteworthy, who was in the habit of consuming daily a bucket of wine and forty pounds of flesh.

Constantine, upon the death, and by the will, of his father *Constantius Chlorus*, — who had always shown favor to the Christians "because those who were true to their God would be true to their emperor also," — had been called in 306 from the army in Britain to be emperor at Rome. He had inherited from his father a tolerant temper towards all religions, together with a certain inclination towards Christianity, which became decided and controlling, through an extraordinary occurrence that happened during his expedition to Rome, in 312, against the tyrant Maxentius, the superstitious defender of the pagan Sacra (§ 27). This, was the appearance of the sign of the cross in the heavens at mid-day bearing the inscription "Hoc vince," — an occurrence, in respect to all the details of which it is impossible now to attain absolute certainty, but whose essential truth is proved by the threefold testimony of Eusebius,[2] Lactantius,[3] and Rufinus.[4]

---

[1] These are not to be confounded with the writings mentioned in § 11, 4.

[2] Vita Constant. I. 27 seq.

[3] De mortt. persecutorum, c. 44.

[4] Hist. Eccl I. 9.

This testimony is entitled to credit all the more, from the fact that it is impossible to accuse Constantine of fabricating the account, either at the time of the expedition in order to encourage his soldiers, — because there were so many pagans among them, that Libanius attributes the victory to the army's sacrificing to the gods, — or at a later time in order to obtain influence and authority for himself, — because he never made official announcement of the occurrence. Furthermore, Constantine testified upon his oath to the truth of the occurrence, and there is no good reason to charge him with perjury, and the report which Lactantius gives of it is altogether independent of that given by Eusebius, being earlier than his. In consequence of this marvel, which undoubtedly had a subjective ground in the feeling of Constantine at the time, the emperor caused the splendid banner of the cross, the Labarum,[1] to be made, and after his victory over Maxentius publicly acknowledged, under the sign of the cross upon a pillar set up in the Roman Forum: *Τούτῳ τῷ σωτηριώδει σημείῳ, τῷ ἀληϑεῖ ἐλέγχῳ τῆς ἀνδρίας, τὴν πόλιν ὑμῶν ζυγοῦ τυραννικοῦ διασωϑεῖσαν ἠλευϑέρωσα.* Yet it was only by degrees, that Christianity gained the entire victory over paganism in Constantine's mind; and it was only slowly, that his feelings led him to a positive confession of the new religion.

In the year 312, Constantine, in connection with Licinius in Illyricum, issued a law favorable to the Christians, granting freedom of worship to the adherents of all religions. But inasmuch as this statute was misconstrued, in such a manner as to operate adversely to the spread of the Christian religion, Constantine, in 313, issued a second law unconditionally securing to every subject of the empire the right to practise such religion as he pleased, and, in particular, the right to pass from paganism to Christianity (Euseb. X. 5; Lactant. De mortt. perss. c. 48). The motives of Constantine in this, were political to some extent undoubtedly, but not merely and solely such; for the great numbers and the high influence of the pagans in the empire, taken in connection with the unworldly and unambitious spirit of Christianity, would, in themselves considered, have deterred an ambitious prince from siding with the new religion. Upon the issuing of this edict, the third emperor *Maximin* in Asia, already terrified by drought, famine and pestilence (Euseb. IX. 8), was compelled to penally forbid the employment of violence towards the Christians (Euseb. IX. 9); nay, after an unsuccessful battle with Licinius, in 313, he began himself to make positive concessions to the Christians, — allowing them by edict to rebuild their churches, to worship in their own way, and restoring to them property that had been confiscated (Euseb. IX. 10). The tyrant however soon died a horrible death, consumed by an inward fire, his flesh falling from his bones, and his eyes from their sockets, and calling out in his delirium — "it was not I but others that did it," (Lactant. De mortt. perss. c. 49; Euseb. IX. 10).

---

[1] Described by Eusebius, De Vita Const. I. 31. The monogram of the name of Christ, with the symbol of the cross, was affixed to the crown upon the top of the shaft.

Constantine and *Licinius*, now the sole rulers of the Empire, were soon involved in contests respecting the boundaries of their respective domains. After a defeat in 314 *Licinius* became the inferior, and from this time altered his bearing towards the Christians. He saw in them the secret friends of Constantine, lent a willing ear to the insinuations of the pagan priests, and insulted, oppressed, and tormented the Christians in various ways, so that even martyr-blood flowed anew (Euseb. X. 8; Vit. Const. I. 51 seq.; II. 1 seq.). The contest now assumed more and more the character of a religious war. Licinius believed himself called to restore the reverence for the ancient divinities, Constantine, to win the victory for Christianity. The former solemnly sacrificed to the gods before going into battle, and vowed to destroy their enemies the Christians; the latter made the cross his banner and pledge of victory (Euseb. Vit. Const. II. 4, seq. 16). *Constantine* triumphed, and in 323 became ruler of the whole Roman empire; Licinius being put to death by his orders.

From this time onward the emperor was completely convinced of the truth of Christianity, and the falsity of paganism, and sought by every means to unite his subjects in the confession of Christ. Yet he cherished a toleration towards heathenism which sometimes degenerated into a religious syncretism. In the year 319, he issued a law allowing the public practice of the pagan rites of worship (Codex Theodos. L. IX. Tit. 16, c. 1, 2), and in the year 321 (Cod. Theodos. X. 10, 1), he even ordered that in some instances the haruspices should be consulted,—a custom which in 319 he had declared to be "superstitio." These maxims of toleration, which were now connected with a kind of profession of Christianity, may be seen particularly in the proclamation which he issued on becoming master of Asia (Euseb. Vita Const. II. 48 seq.). In the first part of his reign, he commanded pagan temples to be destroyed only in particular instances; e. g., when the worship, as was the case in Phœnicia, was connected with horrible debaucheries, or, as in other places, was associated with the performance of pretended miracles by the priests (Euseb. Vit. Const. III. 55 seq.). He also razed to the ground the idol temples which had been erected upon the sites of the sacred places in Palestine. But in the latter part of his reign, Constantine's displeasure towards the enormities of paganism became more earnest and active, and in the last year of his rule he formally forbade the sacrificia publica,—a law, indeed, which was but little executed. But although Constantine in these and other ways showed his zeal for the Christian church, and a somewhat earnest religiousness, yet during his whole life there was a bar to his attendance upon the entire worship of the church; for he did not receive baptism till shortly before his death. The rite was administered to him on Pentecost 337, at a castle in Nicomedia, by Eusebius bishop of Nicomedia, and in the presence of many other bishops (Euseb. Vit. Const. IV. 61 seq.). Constantine was probably sincere when upon this occasion he promised, should God spare his life, to pursue a course of action in accordance with his profession. After his baptism he would no longer wear the imperial purple, but retained the white baptismal garments of the neophyte. He died before the conclusion of the feast, in his 65th year, and hoping in the Divine mercy. It is to be regretted that this oftentimes wavering and weak, yet really great, emperor,—who under the impulse of passion was guilty even of the murder of his son Crispus and of his own wife Fausta,—could not have had the plain warnings, and evangelical instructions, of a bolder and less dazzled spiritual guide than was the bishop Eusebius.

Constantius, the son of Constantine, became emperor in 337 in conjunction with his brothers Constantine II. and Constans. Constantine II. died in 340, and Constans in 350, from which time till his death in 361 Constantius was sole ruler. He proceeded with still more vigor in suppressing paganism. In 341 he announced in an edict (Cod. Theodos. XVI. 10, 2): "Sacrificiorum aboleatur insania;" and in 346, as well as in 350, 353, 356, he re-enacted this edict, condemning to death those who should violate it, and commanding the pagan temples to be closed. Many pagan temples were now given by the emperor to the bishops and became Christian churches; but not a few of them were destroyed, the emperor taking into his own possession the more important memorials of art and literature. Constantius seems to have been the more violent in his external suppression of paganism, in proportion as the ties were looser that bound his own heart to the gospel.

§ 62.

THE CHURCH UNDER JULIAN THE APOSTATE.

Neander Der Kaiser Julian und sein Zeitalter; Church History, II. 37–89. Van Herwerden De Jul. Imp. rel. Chr. hoste eodemque vindice. Gibbon Decline and Fall, chap. XXII.—XXIV.

A Christian confession like that of the emperor Constantine would naturally call out a reaction from the still powerful pagan party in the Roman empire. This occurred through the emperor *Julian the Apostate*, in whose reign heathenism made its last effort in the Roman Empire to gain an artificial life in order to overpower Christianity.

Julian, a nephew of Constantine the Great, who when a child had seen his nearest kindred fall a sacrifice to the jealousy of Constantius, and had been trained up in solitude by worthless teachers for the clerical profession, soon learned to look with a secret bitterness upon the existing state of things, while a Christianity thus forced upon him by a hated court could not take root in his heart. The study of the orations of *Libanius*, the distinguished opponent of the Christians and afterwards Julian's panegyrist, imparted to his mind a decidedly pagan bent from his twentieth year onward. The pagan party, rendered fanatical by the severe treatment which they had received, sought in every mode to draw over Julian to their interest; while the glitter of the mingled mysticism and speculation of the pagan Platonists in Ionia made a much greater impression upon a man like Julian, than did a religion of humility and self-denial, which had indeed been taught to him from the New Testament, but which he did not apprehend with the heart, and the hypocritical profession of which by so many about him only made his own hearty paganism all the more dear. On being elevated to the throne in 361 by the soldiers in Gaul (at Paris), he laid aside the mask. While he was pushing onward towards the East, Constantius died, and Julian, now the sole emperor, employed all his power and art to restore paganism. He discharged the functions of the imperial office of Pontifex Maximus with unheard-of zeal. Frugal as he was in the expenditures of his court, he yet spared no expense in providing sacrificial offerings. He slaughtered hundreds of bullocks in sacrifice, and it was his delight, even though accompanied only by a crowd of old women, to lead the victim with his own imperial hand to the officiating priest. During a violent rain-storm he stood by the altar under the open sky, both flattered and vexed by the loud cheers of the populace, while all others had taken refuge under the roof of the temple. At the same time he attempted an internal reformation of paganism by means of Christianity. He forced heathenism to copy the Christian eleemosynary institutions, and even to employ a species of disciplinary penance. In imitation of the Christian sermon, he caused the pagan priests, dressed in splendid vestments, to deliver their mystical explanations of the old classic myths to the people. Boasting a philosophic toleration, and made shrewd by both history and policy, he would not overthrow Christianity by bloody persecution, but by the more sure method, as he supposed, of craft. Hence he granted toleration to all parties and sects, in order that they might come into collision with each other. Hence he prohibited the Christians from opening schools for literary culture, and shut out their youth from the study of the ancient classics, in order that the church should either sink down in ignorance, or be compelled to employ pagan teachers. Hence he permitted the Jews, — whose ancient popular religion he respected, — to attempt the rebuilding of their temple, in order to offend the Christians, and to falsify the prediction of Christ. He expended much money and labor, through his viceroy Alypius, upon this object; but, — so relates a pagan historian, Ammianus Marcellinus Hist. XXIII. 1: compare Gregor. Naz. Orat. IV.; Chrysost. Homil. III. Adv. Jud.; Socrat. H. E. III. 20; Sozom. V. 22; Theodoret. III. 15; Julian. Ep. 25, — fearful balls of fire and tremblings of the earth interrupted the work three times in succession, when the terrified Jews left the waste and desolate city, and again dispersed themselves. As in this instance, so in others, the pride of the emperor was humbled. But the more plainly he saw that paganism was dead, and heard the jeers of the populace at his own vain zeal for it, the more embittered did he become against Christianity; so that those bloody persecutions in several of the provinces, which Julian took no special pains to suppress, might have grown into a general persecution, had he not, in 363, in early manhood, fallen in the Persian war, after an active but futile reign of twenty months. With his dying cry (according to a tradition preserved by Sozomen H. E. VI. 2; Theodoret. H. E. III. 20

[25]): "O Galilaean thou hast conquered!" the entire work of his wearisome and anxious life came to nought.

§ 63.

THE CHURCH UNDER THE EMPERORS AFTER JULIAN.

From the time of Julian onwards, the series of Christian emperors was unbroken, and the church grew unhindered, tranquilly but mightily, under the aegis of imperial and universal toleration.

Jovian (d. 364) acted decidedly upon the principle of a wise toleration, and *Valentinian I.* in the West (d. 375) issued an edict in 364, that every one should be free to practise in matters of religion according to his own convictions. Under his rule Christianity spread rapidly through its own inward force, and paganism sank lower continually, so that in a law of 368 the heathen are called Pagani, and the old pagan usages and customs were to be found in but few of the ancient noble families. *Gratian* (d. 383), the son of Valentinian, was the first emperor who laid aside the vestments of a Pontifex Maximus, though he still retained the title; and it was he who removed, a second time, from before the Roman senate-house the altar dedicated to Victory, which had once before been thrown down by Constantius and replaced by Julian. Gratian also imposed various restrictions upon paganism, by legal enactments.

Severer regulations for suppressing idol worship were enacted by *Theodosius I.* surnamed the Great, who became emperor in the East after the death of *Valens* in 379, and sole ruler of the Empire after the death, in 392, of *Valentinian II.* in the West. He finally made every species of idol worship a treasonable offence, and his successors both in the East and West, after the division of the Empire at his death in 395, regarded it in the same light. The destruction of heathen temples now became a Christian custom and virtue.

In the *Eastern* Roman Empire, the destruction of the mysterious colossal image of Serapis and his temple, at Alexandria, in 391, — a destruction which the pagans, in accordance with an ancient prophecy, expected would be followed by the sinking back of the earth into original chaos, — signalized the entire downfall of paganism. As early as the end of the first quarter of the 5th century, all open and visible traces of heathenism had disappeared in the Eastern Empire, although the relics of it which had been concealed under a Christianized drapery were not entirely destroyed until the 6th century (§ 94). In the *Western* Roman Empire, the adherents of idol worship, taking courage from the frequent attacks of the barbarians, and falsely attributing the perilous condition of the government to the Christians, continued to exist either openly or in secret, till into the 7th century.

§ 64.

PAGAN POLEMICAL WRITERS, AND CHRISTIAN APOLOGISTS.

1. The change in the position of Christianity now introduced a different form of opposition to it from writers. Most of its literary opponents, adopting the New-Platonic views, instead of directly attacking Christianity, now only claimed an equal recognition for both paganism and Christianity. While the New-Platonic sceptics of the preceding period had altogether excluded the Christian religion from their eclectic system, many of them, influenced by the present humbled condition of paganism, now acknowledged a divine element in Christianity, and ranging both religions in one class as the subjective results of the workings of the human mind, claimed equal rights for paganism, asserting that the Deity would be most honored by a variety of religions, each and all seeking to express the inner nature of one absolute religion. Such were the sentiments of the orator *Themistius* (the paraphrast of Aristotle, d. 390), expressed in his address to the emperor

Jovian on his entrance upon the consular office, for the purpose of confirming him in the principles of a universal toleration of all religions; and expressed also in another similar address of his to the emperor Valens. The civilian *Symmachus*, the Prefectus urbi at the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th century, set forth the same views in his address to Valentinian II. in 384 (Symmach. Epistolar. X. 61), urging the restoration of the altar of Victory (§ 63). In this address, he asks the emperor, among other things, to distinguish his own private religion from the religio urbis, and contends that inasmuch as divine things are beyond the ken of man, and there is no one particular way into these secrets, men would do best to follow in the footsteps of their ancestors, who had prospered under their own religion for so many centuries.

There was, however, another class of more *bitter opponents* of Christianity. At their head stands the emperor *Julian*, who, in his work against Christianity, in three books, fragments of which are preserved in Cyril's reply to it, made the only elaborate direct attack of this period. In this work, the emperor, with philosophic hatred, heaps upon Christianity and its adherents all the objections and reproaches furnished by a cavilling study of the Bible and of history, and a thoroughly pagan understanding. To this class belongs, also, the unknown author of the dialogue called *Philopatris*,—written, probably by a rhetorician, in imitation of Lucian to whom it is falsely ascribed,—which contains a satirical account of the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the monks, whom it represents as taking pleasure in the reverses of Julian, and therefore as the enemies of their country. The orator *Libanius* (d. 395), in his noteworthy plea for the preservation of the temples, Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶν, addressed to Theodosius I., appears as a moderate New-Platonist, and says many excellent and truthful things, but in his *Orationes* frequently indulges in satirical and malicious remarks against the Christian religion. Lastly, the historians *Eunapius* and *Zosimus*, in the 5th century, exhibited a virulent polemic feeling against Christianity, in their attempt to prove that the downfall of the Roman Empire was the natural consequence of the destruction of the ancient reverence for the gods, and the spread of Christianity.

2. This more favorable condition of the church did not result in the decline of Christian Apologetics. A long series of *Apologists* belongs to this period, possessing varying powers and gifts, and characterized by a more or less earnest apologetic temper.

The series opens in the 4th century with *Coelius Lactantius Firmianus* of Italy, a pupil of Arnobius, whose opinions he adopted, carrying them out apparently even to the verge of Manichaeism. He was for a time the tutor of Crispus, the unfortunate son of Constantine; was involved in his pupil's misfortunes, and died about 330. On account of the beauty of his style, he has been denominated Cicero Christianus. His chief apologetic work is the *Institutionum divinarum libri VII*, written during the Diocletian persecution while he was a rhetorician in Nicomedia. It consists of disquisitions upon the nature and influence of Christianity. *Eusebius Pamphili* (d. 340), the learned and pacific bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, suspected not without reason of a slight inclination to Arianism, and the distinguished author in church history (§ 6), has left two apologetic works which together constitute one comprehensive whole. The first is a preparatory work, designed to be an introduction to Christian instruction. It consists of a literary collection, in 15 books, similar to the Clementine Stromata, and is entitled *Προπαρασκευὴ εὐαγγελική*, *Praeparatio evangelica.* The second work is the *Εὐαγγελικὴ ἀπόδειξις*, *Demonstratio evangelica*, an extended investigation of Christian doctrine, in twenty books, of which only ten are extant. Besides these we have from Eusebius an apologetic work *Contra Hieroclem;* his work *Contra Porphyrium* is lost. *Athanasius* (d. 373), the greatest man of the century, bishop of Alexandria, wrote probably while yet a young deacon his two apologetic works characterized by remarkable originality, power, depth, and clearness; the *Λόγος κατὰ Ἑλλήνων,* and the exposition of Christian doctrine following it under the title *Περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ Λόγου.* *Julius Firmicus Maternus*, a pagan converted to

Christianity in the reign of Constantius, has left a work *De errore profanarum religionum.* *Ambrose* (d. 397), the highly venerated bishop of Milan, uttered a brief but strong word in favor of Christianity, in opposition to the request which Symmachus made to Valentinian II., and was successful (*Epistolae* 17, 18, *ad Valentinianum*); and the Spanish poet *Prudentius*, about 400, also attacked the views of Symmachus (*Adversus Symmachum, libri II.*)

To the 5th century belong two Greek Apologists: *Cyril*, the vehement bishop of Alexandria (d. 444), the author of a work in ten books *Contra impium Julianum*, Ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν ϑρησκείας πρὸς τὰ τοῦ ἐν αϑέοις Ἰουλιανοῦ; and *Theodoret*, the discreet bishop of Cyros on the Euphrates (d. about 458), who composed an apologetic work *De curandis affectionibus Graecorum*, Ἑλληνικῶν ϑεραπευτικὴ παϑημάτων, in twelve parts, proving the truth of Christianity by comparing it with what resembles it in the Greek philosophy. At the head of the Latin Apologists of the 5th century stands *Augustine*, bishop of Hippo in Africa, the most renowned of all the fathers. In his letters, and others of his writings, he throws out many hints that possess high apologetic force and value, but his great apologetic work is the *De civitate Dei;* a treatise in twenty-two books, describing the origin, nature, progress, and ultimate end of the kingdom of God. It is composed with great comprehensiveness, depth, and thoroughness, and is the most important apologetic work of the patristic period. The friend and pupil of Augustine, *Paulus Orosius* of Tarraco (d. about 417), wrote his *Historiarum libri VII. adversus paganos*, coming down to the year 416, to refute the pagan charge that all the evils which were befalling the state were due to Christianity. Lastly, the Gallic presbyter *Salvianus* (d. 484), in his treatise *De gubernatione Dei* shows that the miseries of the age, and the incursions of the barbarians, were to be regarded as the punitive judgments of the Deity.

CHAPTER SECOND.

CHRISTIANITY BEYOND THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

§ 65.

INSTRUMENTALITIES TO THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

The struggle and the victory of Christianity during this period was not confined to the wide limits of the Roman Empire. The Christian church also obtained a foothold in many places and regions outside of the Roman sway. Trade in earthly goods sometimes served to impart an eternal one. Many Asiatic and African Christians, fleeing from the Diocletian persecution, carried the gospel with them into new countries. Monks upon the Roman borders in Asia and Africa, gaining the confidence of the barbarian hordes, became the preachers of Christianity to them. The migration of nations, which shattered the colossal structure of the Roman Empire,[1] prepared the way in Europe for modern Christian civilization, by the general contact of the barbarian masses with the Roman world, and more particularly by the intercourse of Christian captives with their heathen captors, or of pagan servants with their Christian masters. Christian females, and especially Christian princesses, pointed their husbands and their subjects to a higher life. These and many other agencies, with which the activity of really faithful and intelligent missionaries was not seldom associated, co-operated to spread Christianity throughout the *οἰκουμένη*.

---

[1] Rome itself fell a prey in 476 to Odoacer, king of the Heruli.

§ 66.

CHRISTIANITY IN ASIA.

1. In *Persia*,[1] until the 4th century, the number of Christians had been considerably large, under the supervision of their metropolitan, the bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon. But now the Magi had succeeded, by making use of the ecclesiastical and religious connection of the Christians with Rome, in rendering the Persian king, *Sapores II.* (310–381), suspicious of a secret political connection between them and the Roman Emperor. Constantine did indeed by a letter recommend them to the protection of the Persian king (Euseb. Vita Const. IV. 9 seq.); but at a later day, a war that had broken out between the Romans under Constantius and the Persians, about 343, stirred up,—after severe measures of various kinds had been resorted to against the Christians, and their bishops had refused under arrest to participate in the worship of the Sun,—a long and bloody persecution.[2] The aged and venerable bishop *Simeon* of Seleucia died joyfully in 343, the first episcopal martyr, and his example, together with that of the aged *Guhsciatazades*,—the head of the royal household under whose care Sapores had grown up,—who was beheaded for his confession of Christianity, only heightened the courage of the Christians. A hundred clergymen, and as many laymen, were led to the place of execution, along with Simeon; among them, *Phusik*, a member of the royal household, had his tongue torn out by the roots. Still more violent was the persecution of 344, as the edict of death was now extended expressly to all Christians, and not to the clergy merely. Many of all ranks suffered martyrdom, until the death of *Azades*, a favorite of the king, again restricted the persecution to the clergy. This persecution continued forty years, with varying violence and extent. By

---

[1] Malcolm History of Persia.

[2] Assemani Acta sanctorum martyrum orientalium et occidentalium.

the treaty of peace, which in Jovinian's reign terminated the war between Rome and Persia, the ancient Christian city Nisibis was ceded to Persia; but the Christians in it were permitted to depart. Under *Jezdegerdes I.* (401–420) the prospects of the church in Persia were more favorable, through the influence of bishop *Maruthas* of Tagrit in Mesopotamia, who had gained the confidence of a Persian court by his wise management of some political negotiations entrusted to him, and who made use of it for the advantage of the Christians. The destruction of a Persian fire-temple, instigated by bishop *Abdas*, about 418, was the occasion of a new persecution which lasted thirty years, and was particularly violent under *Varanes V.* (420–438). The martyrdom of the Christian deacon *Benjamin* at this time, is worthy of notice. He had languished in prison for two years, and was then released at the request of a Roman ambassador with the proviso that he should not preach Christ to a Parsee. He did not assent to the condition, as it was hoped and expected he would, preached to all wherever he went, and was beheaded in a horrible manner. Another Christian named *Jacobus* suffered a slow death, by having one limb after another torn from his body. Still another, who was the master of a thousand slaves was made a slave, and the worst of his slaves made his master. Many Persian Christians took refuge in the Roman dominions. The refusal to deliver these up caused a new war between Theodosius II. and Persia, in 422. The peace which was made about 427, and particularly the generous act of *Acacius* bishop of Amida in Mesopotamia, who ransomed seven thousand Persian prisoners from the Romans by the sale of church utensils, and sent them back to their native land with the means of subsistence on the way (Sozomen. VII. 21 seq.), contributed to render the condition of the Christians in Persia more tolerable. But this was not of long continuance, and it was not until the 5th century, when the Persian church had become disconnected from the Roman upon doctrinal grounds, that the external circumstances of the Persian Christians were permanently improved.

2. The first seeds of Christianity had been planted in *Armenia*, in the preceding period. In the 4th century bishop *Gregory*, surnamed Illuminator, was instrumental in converting the king *Tiridates*, and in founding Christian schools, and thus in establishing the church upon a firmer foundation. In the 5th century, the Armenians received from *Miesrob*, once a royal secretary and afterwards a missionary eremite, an alphabet and translation of the Scriptures. In the middle of this century, Persian violence sought to crush the church in Armenia; from this resulted a religious war, during the distractions of which, the Armenian *Moses* of *Chorene* wrote the history of his native land.[1]

3. The ancient Christianity planted in *Arabia* by the apostle Paul had from the beginning been hindered in its spread, by the violent hostility of the Jews resident there. About the year 350, the emperor Constantius made a new attempt to diffuse more widely the existing Arabian Christianity, which was then Arian, among the Homerites or Sabaeans of Arabia Felix. *Theophilus the Indian*, of Diu, who had been carried in early youth as a hostage to Constantinople, had been trained up there and educated for the clerical profession, and had been consecrated as a bishop for the conversion of the Arabians, was now sent as a missionary with an embassy and presents to one of the Arabian chieftains, in order to obtain leave for free worship for the Christian merchants, and to build a church at the Emperor's expense. This chieftain, converted to Christianty, built three churches at his own expense, — one in Taphar the capital, one in the Roman port Aden (Portus Romanus), and one in the Persian port Hormuz (Philostorgius II. 6; III. 4). Much was done in this period towards the conversion of several Arab tribes, by monks resident upon the borders of Palestine; particularly by *Hilarion* and *Moses* in the 4th century, and *Euthymius* in the first half of the 5th. This latter was the instrument of the conversion of *Ashbetus*, the chieftain of a

---

[1] Mosis Chorenensis Hist. Armen. Libb. III.; translated into French by De Florival. Neumann Geschichte der Armen. Literatur. Saint-Martin Mémoires sur l' Arménie. Chamich History of Armenia.

Saracenic tribe, and afterwards of his consecration, under the baptismal name of *Peter*, as bishop over it. Contemporaneously with these lived *Simeon* the Stylite in Syria (§ 74, 1), who stood for several years upon a pillar thirty-six ells in height, and by his extraordinary asceticism, together with the piercing cogency of his exhortations, moved hundreds and thousands of Nomadic Saracens to receive baptism. To this Theodoret (Hist. religiosa c. 26), who was an eyewitness, testifies. The wandering life of the Arabs was extremely unfavorable to all permanent influences and impressions, and the vehement enmity of the Arabian Jews against Christianity still continued. Nevertheless there is credible testimony from Oriental sources to the fact, that previously to the Mohammedan period Christianity had obtained the ascendency over many important Arab tribes; and it is undeniably certain that in the 6th century a regularly constituted Arabian-Christian State (Nedschràn) was in existence. Even a bloody persecution, instigated in the 6th century by Jewish malignity, could not permanently destroy Christian institutions in Arabia. In this century a regent, *Dhu-Nowâs*, who had apostatized to Judaism from Christianity, ruled over Yemen, and attempted by horrible persecutions to make Judaism take the place of Christianity. He overran the Christian State Nedschràn, and twenty thousand Christians are said to have been slain. A Christian who had escaped the sword fled to Constantinople, and obtained the intercession of the Greek Emperor with the king of Abyssinia, in behalf of his persecuted brethren. The Abyssinian king sent an army, under the command of Aretas, against Dhu-Nowâs. The Jewish tyrant was conquered, and the Christian Abyssinians (§ 67) took possession of Yemen, and rebuilt the churches that had been destroyed.[1]

4. Respecting the spread of Christianity in *East India*, of which we had only uncertain notices in the former period, we now have entirely reliable information. The account

---

[1] Schultens Historia Joctanidarum. Ecchellensis Historia Arabum. Assemani Saggio sull' origine cet. degli Arabi. Marraccii Prodromus ad Koranum.

which Chrysostom gives, and which speaks even of an Indian translation of the Scriptures, is indeed liable to the same doubts and conjectures that accompany the earlier notices of India (see § 18, 1); but *Theophilus the Indian*, who labored in Arabia in the 4th century as has been mentioned (§ 66, 3), according to entirely unambiguous data actually preached the gospel in *East India* proper ("in Diu, and the other Indian countries," is the phraseology), and he is reported to have found Christians of an earlier period there. Lastly, absolutely certain information is furnished, about 535, by *Cosmas Indicopleustes*, first a travelling merchant and afterwards a monk, who in his *Τοπογραφία Χριστιανική*[1] speaks of Christian churches in three places in East India, — one, upon the island *Taprobane* (Ceylon), another at *Male* on the pepper-island (Malabar), and a third at *Calliana* (perhaps Kalamina, afterwards Mayilapur or domus Thomae, § 18, near Madras; Assemani Bibl. Or. III. 2, 33) where there was a Persian bishop.

5. Towards the middle of the 4th century, before the death of Constantine the Great, about 330, the conversion of the *Iberians*, dwelling on the shores of the Black Sea in the present country of Georgia, was effected. Rufinus (I. 10), and Moses Chorenensis (L. II. c. 83), give an account, based upon the narrative of an Iberian chieftain who had attained the dignity of a Roman Dux, of the patriarchal simplicity with which the conversion of this people was brought about. A captive Christian female, *Numia* by name, a slave in an Iberian family, by her behavior had acquired general respect and love. Through the recovery, first of the child of the princess, and afterwards of the princess herself, in answer to her simple, humble prayers offered in faith, she came to be the object of the thankful veneration of the princely family. The remarkable deliverance of the prince himself from death while hunting, after he had addressed himself in prayer to the God of the Christians, brought his mind to a decision. Prince and princess now gave themselves up to the teachings

---

[1] In Galland. T. IX.

of the Christian female, and in their turn imparted instruction, the one to the men, and the other to the women, of their people, and at length asked that a bishop might be sent to them from the Roman empire. It is probable, that from the Iberians the gospel was disseminated among the neighboring *Lazians* (Colchians) and *Abasgians*, in the 6th century, during the reigns of Justin and Justinian.

§ 67.

CHRISTIANITY IN AFRICA.

Of the African nations, the *Abyssinians* or *Ethiopians* received Christianity during this period. Two Christian youth, *Frumentius* and *Aedesius*, belonging to the corps of *Meropius*, a learned Tyrian explorer, which was murdered on landing upon the coast of Abyssinia for water, were spared on account of their tender age. They were taken into the service of the prince, and won his confidence. After his death they conducted the education of his youthful successor, and Frumentius obtained great influence over the government, which he used in behalf of Christianity. At length they had leave to return home. Aedesius (from whose personal narrative to himself Rufinus (H. E. I. 9) composes this account) became a presbyter at Tyre; but *Frumentius* felt constrained to carry the blessings of the gospel to the people of Ethiopia, who had now become dear to him. For this purpose he applied to bishop *Athanasius* of Alexandria, — according to Rufinus, in the first part of Athanasius's episcopate, about 326 or 327, — was by him consecrated a missionary bishop, and then founded the Abyssinian church, for whose use he probably made a version of the Scriptures. Somewhat later, *Theophilus the Indian* also came to Abyssinia, and taught in the principal city Axuma, but as he was an Arian immediately fell into a dispute with Frumentius, and Constantius was foolish enough to warn the Abyssinian princes against Frumentius, — a warning, however, which seems to have effected nothing. In the 6th century, the Abyssinian Christians were sufficiently numerous, as has been mentioned (§ 66, 3), to interfere for the protection of their brethren in Arabia Felix from the persecution of a Jewish tyrant, and to overthrow the Jewish government there.

§ 68.

CHRISTIANITY IN EUROPE.

The following European nations were incorporated into the Christian church, during this period.

1. The *Goths.* This nation, a people of German stock, had received the first knowledge of Christianity, in the 3d century, through some Christian captives from Cappadocia, and a bishop of the Goths appeared at the council at Nice. But Christianity was now more firmly established and generally diffused among them, — and particularly among one branch of the *West-Goths*, the Thervingians, — in the second half of the 4th century, by *Ulphilas*, who, according to Philostorgius (H. E. II. 5), was a descendant of one of the Cappadocian families which had been carried off captive in the preceding century. After experiencing much opposition, he at length secured the confidence of the Goths, chiefly by conducting their negotiations with the emperor Valens (364—378), and now as their bishop labored for the Christianizing of his nation, to whom, owing to the undue influence of the Arianism which then prevailed in the Western Roman Empire, he taught the Arian[1] instead of the Orthodox

---

[1] According to Philostorgius, Ulphilas was consecrated bishop of the Goths in the reign of Constantine the Great, by the Arian Eusebius of Nicomedia. All the other historians, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, agree that Ulphilas and the Goths were at first orthodox, and that they were brought over to Arianism by the influence of the zealous Arian emperor Constantius. Sozomen (H. E. II. 41) states that Ulphilas first confessed Arianism in 360. The latter of these two statements is probably the correct one, since there is but little doubt, as Socrates

doctrine. Ulphilas gave the Goths an alphabet, and a version of the whole Bible, with the exception of the books of Kings, which seemed to him to be unfit for a warlike people. Of this translation, a great part of the New Testament, — viz.: the four Gospels, the 2d of Corinthians, large portions of the other Pauline Epistles (particularly Romans), with the exception of Hebrews, — has been preserved, together with some few fragments of the Old Testament. From this branch of the Goths, and chiefly through the instrumentality of Ulphilas, Arian Christianity gradually spread, not without opposition and sometimes the shedding of martyr-blood, to the other branches,[1] and finally to the *East-Goths*, the Greuthingians. The Arianism of the Goths received a severe shock in the downfall of the East-Gothic kingdom in Italy in 553, but it did not lose its last prop until, at the council of Toledo, in 589, the West-Gothic king of Spain, *Reccared*, was received into the Catholic church. *Chrysostom*, while bishop of Constantinople, labored with earnest zeal to establish the Catholic doctrine among the Goths; particularly by training up native-born Gothic missionaries, and establishing preaching in Gothic at a particular church in Constantinople (Theodoret. H. E. V. 30).

2. The *Burgundians* and *Franks* in *Gaul.* Christianity had become firmly established in *Gaul* during the former period, as is evinced by the number and importance of the synods convened there;[2] but the influx of new populations, through the migration of nations, rendered new missionary labor necessary, particularly among the *Burgundians* and *Franks*.

About 500 there labored in Gaul for the spread of Christianity, with great success, the missionary bishops *Faustus* of Rhegium, *Avitus* of Vienne (d. 525), and above all *Caesa-*

---

distinctly asserts, that Ulphilas originally followed the doctrine of the Gothic bishop Theophilus, who subscribed the Nicene symbol.

[1] When Alaric captured Rome in 410, he spared the Christian churches, filled with Christian and Pagan refugees, and resounding in the midst of the uproar and din of the scene with hymns of praise and thanksgiving.

[2] Conciliorum Galliae collectio temporum ordine digesta cet. op. et stud. Monachor. congr. S Mauri. T. I. ab a. 177 ad a. 591. Paris. 1799. fol.

rius of Arles; and their labors inured to the benefit of these tribes in particular. In the commencement of the 5th century, the *Burgundians* crowded into Gaul from the Rhine, having already, and probably while dwelling upon the banks of the Rhine, received Christianity in the form of Arianism. *Avitus* labored for the suppression of their Arianism, in conjunction with their king *Gundobald*, who in 499 caused a conference to be held between Avitus and the Arian clergy; and Gundobald's successor *Sigismund* went over to the Catholic church in 517.

Through the Burgundians, Christianity passed to the Salian *Franks*. When these first penetrated into Gaul, in 486, they were still pagan. But the wife of their king Clovis, *Clotilda*, the daughter of the Burgundian king Gundobald, continued to exercise the rites of Christian worship in the Frankish court, obtained leave from her husband to baptize their children, and labored earnestly for his conversion. The warlike inferiority of the Christian Romans was at first a sign for Clovis of the inferiority of their God; nevertheless the unwearied and affectionate representations of Clotilda, in connection with the indications of the aid of the Christian's God in the remarkable cures of bodily and mental diseases at the tomb of the venerated bishop *Martin* of Tours (§ 74, 2),[1] were not without their impression upon the mind of the king. In a war against the Allemani, being hard pressed at the battle of Zülpich (Tolpiacum), Clovis invoked his own gods in vain; but a prayer to the God of the Christians gave him the victory. He now received instruction from *Remigius*, archbishop of Rheims, and was admitted to the Catholic church by baptism on Christmas 496. His nation followed his example.

3. The *British Islands*. The Christian church had long before been established in *Britain* (§ 18), while the *Picts* and *Scots* in *Scotland* and *Ireland*, living in savage enmity towards the Britons, were as yet entirely unacquainted with the gospel.

---

[1] Compare Neander Church History III. 7. Gregorius Turonensis Bibl. Patr. Max. T. XI.

The Christian teachers, who, according to the accounts of English monks, came from Britain to *Ireland* in the 4th century, accomplished at the very best only unimportant results. The Apostle of the Irish was the British-Scot *Patricius* (properly *Succath*), born between 370 and 380 in the village Bonnaven, now called after him Kil-Patrick, near Glasgow.[1] The manifold sufferings which he passed through, when leading the life of a shepherd in Ireland, whither he had been carried and sold by Scottish pirates in his sixteenth year, caused the religion which he had been taught in his childhood to take root and ripen. After six years of captivity he was restored to his friends, by wonderful interpositions of divine providence. Ten years after this he was again taken captive, and sold into Gaul, whence he was ransomed by some Christian merchants. From this time onward the great idea incessantly haunted his soul with living power, that he was called of God to preach the gospel to the Irish, and the celestial voices which sounded within him and around him strengthened the conviction. His kindred endeavored to dissuade him, in vain. He now visited the Gallic cloisters in order to prepare himself more thoroughly for his work, and about 432, according to notices from the 12th century, betook himself to Rome, where he was consecrated bishop and deputed to Ireland by Sixtus III.[2] Having reached the field, nothing could bend the Christian courage of Patricius, and his labors were soon blessed with God's wonderful influences upon the hearts of multitudes. He established a cloister, as the foundation of a system of Christian popular education, and gave the Irish a written language. He was accompanied upon all his perilous and wearisome journeys by a warmly attached Irish Christian youth, whom he named *Benignus*, from his kindly nature. He at length obtained true helpers from Britain also. Patrick is said to have founded the archbishopric of Armagh, afterwards the central point for the Irish church. He believed that he never ought to leave Ireland, even upon a visit, and died there about 460. The important Confessio of his, which is still extant, bears marks of genuineness.[1] The missionary work was continued in his spirit, and soon Ireland was properly denominated the Insula Sanctorum.

---

[1] See the collections of old traditions concerning him, in Usher Britannicarum ecclesiarum antiquitates.

[2] There are many difficulties connected with this tradition of the 12th century. Patrick's own account of himself makes no mention of ordination at Rome, and the Irish church was more closely connected with the Old-British church than with the Romish.

From the Irish cloisters, missionaries went out into various regions, and particularly to the *Picts* in *Scotland.* According to one tradition, a British monk and bishop *Ninya*, who had been educated at Rome, and after him a British presbyter *Gildas*, had already carried the seeds of Christianity, in the 5th century, to one portion of them. The Irish abbot *Columba*[2] (d. 597) labored with remarkable success among the northern Picts about the year 565, and founded upon the island Hy, or St. Iona, a cloister, which under his management during thirty years acquired great celebrity, and was of great service in preserving the knowledge of the Scriptures.

But while the wild inhabitants of Ireland and Scotland were thus being brought under the influence of the gospel, the primitive Christian institutions in *England* were disturbed and destroyed by the pagan Anglo-Saxons, whom the British had called to their assistance against the incursions of the Picts and Scots; and the Christian Britons were forced back into Wales, and the mountains of Northumberland and Cornwall. National enmity prevented any influence from the Britons towards the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, and it was not until the following period that the conversion of these latter was effected by missionaries from the Roman church.

---

[1] Patricii Opuscula ed. Waraeus. Joscelin was his principal biographer in the 12th century (Vita S. Patricii: See Acta Sanctorum March T. II. p. 540).

[2] Braun De Culdeis. Jamieson Historical account of the Culdees. See authorities on p. 73, Note 1.

SECTION SECOND.

Church Polity.

§ 69.

RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO THE STATE.

1. The Christian Church in the first period had been entirely separate from the heathen State, and not only so, but in direct antagonism to it. It now in the 4th century entered into an intimate connection with the Christian State. It exerted a direct influence upon civil institutions, and claimed protection and favor from the government. This change was accompanied with the public profession of Christianity by the Roman emperor. And as the emperor had previously been the head of the pagan State religion, as Pontifex Maximus, so now he assumed a similar relationship to the Christian church of the Empire. Constantine indeed declared (Euseb. Vit. Const. IV. 24) that he was only *ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ἔξω τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, and that the bishops alone were *ἐπίσκοποι τῶν ἔσω τῆς ἐκκλησίας*; and this expression, originally spoken as a pleasantry, was by no means intended to be the foundation of a theory of church rights, and least of all of such an one as would make the emperor anything more than a protector of the church, or concede to him more than a so-called Jus *circa* Sacra. But with this care for the external welfare of the church, an influence upon its internal affairs was almost unavoidable, since the external incloses the internal, and the emperor was himself a member of the church, — an influence,

moreover, that was all the more natural, in proportion as the welfare of the church actually lay near to the heart of the emperor. As the Christian emperors deemed it their duty to maintain and protect the church in all its external and internal rights, and in its entire freedom of action, so also they regarded it as a duty, the neglect of which would be an injury to the true church and its members as well as a violation of their own consciences, to watch over and preserve the purity of its doctrine. The example of Constantine, who called a general council of bishops, in 325, from all parts of his empire, to settle the doctrinal controversies which had broken out, was followed without scruple or hesitation by all the later emperors. They issued the decree for such general councils, under their own imperial authority, and made provision for the execution of it; whereby, consequently, all recusants made themselves liable to civil punishments. In this way the Christian emperor acquired the right, founded upon custom originally, to initiate, in harmony and co-operation with the church, the final and binding decision of points of doctrine, and to enforce this decision by the power of the government. It is true, that this in itself fluctuating and undefined power might be abused in various ways, by misinterpretation and a false or too strict application. The emperor might easily arrogate to himself the right to arbitrarily guide the whole course of ecclesiastical and theological discussion and decision, or to force a merely external agreement and uniformity upon the universal church of the empire, by violence or artifice, — in short, to convert the church into the hand-maid of the State. In such use and misuse, originated that mixing of the intrigues and quarrels of the corrupt Byzantine court with ecclesiastical affairs which brought untold evil and misery upon the church, particularly the Eastern,[1] and stands an example of warning for all time. But on the other hand, it was difficult to alter what had been definitely determined and established, and the emperors were disposed at least not to interfere with that which passed for the right, or which actually was so. Furthermore, it was held to be undeniable that the now Christian State *owed* a certain species of protection and favor to the church, and that an excess over the just limits in the case no more destroyed the obligation upon one side and the claim on the other, than did the fact that the church sometimes over-stepped its limits release it from the duty of pervading the whole social, civil, and political life of the Empire with its own sanctifying spirit.

---

[1] In the West, the rising influence of the bishop of Rome was a check upon State influence, as was also the downfall of the Western Roman Empire in 476.

2. The immediate consequences of the new relation between the Church and State were the several *governmental favors*, dearly purchased indeed, received from the State by the Church, whereby the latter was enabled to exert influence more freely upon the former, and to effect to some extent an improvement in the social and political condition of the Empire. These were the following: —

a. *Sabbath laws;* particularly the edict issued by Constantine the Great in 321 against the outward profanation of Sunday, by which the church observance of this day was greatly promoted (Comp. § 78).

b. The partial *provision by the State for the support of the churches.* Of the greatest importance in this respect was the law (Cod. Theodos. L. XVI. Tit. 2, § 4), by which Constantine, in 321, gave the church the right to receive legacies of all kinds; a law to which, on account of many abuses that had arisen under it, Valentinian I. was led to add many restrictions. This enactment of Constantine secured great resources to the church; which were needed not merely for the support of the clergy, of public worship, and of church edifices, but also of the poor, the strangers, the aged, the sick, the widows and orphans under the care of the church, and also of those great *eleemosynary institutions* which sprang up within its pale alone.

c. *The exemption of the clergy from the munera publica;* such as the obligation to pay socage money, to serve in the army, to take civil office, and the like. In the previous period, it had obtained as a rule of the church, that no one who by his position was liable to the imposition of state-burdens, should be eligible to a sacred office. Constantine, in consequence, partially exempted clergymen from the munera publica, in 313, and then entirely, in a law issued in 319 (Cod. Theod. XVI. 2, 2). But this law was abused to the disadvantage of the State, and hence in 320 he made an addition to it, of a clause which forbade the highest class of nobles and wealthy persons entering into the clerical profession. It was soon perceived that this ordinance would work unfavorably for the Church, and various means were devised to harmonize the interests of the Church and State, until finally in 383 the expedient was resorted to, of exempting the clergy entirely from civil burdens and allowing any one to enter the sacred office, and requiring, in the case of such as would be obligated by their wealth and standing to bear civil burdens, that their property should be surrendered to others who should perform the service in their stead (Titul. de decurionibus).

d. *Giving the church a particular jurisdiction.* Disputes between Christians had heretofore been settled within the churches themselves, and of late by the bishops. The decision of the bishop, when, and only when, both parties had agreed to accept him as the judge, had been made legally binding by Constantine (Sozomen. H. E. I. 9). About the same time, there sprang up, though only gradually, another episcopal right, viz.: the intercessio episcoporum; this arose from the fact that conscientious officials in doubtful cases had applied to their bishop for advice, and the bishop in his turn took the opportunity, in important cases, to intercede with the noble and powerful official in behalf of the unfortunate or the oppressed.

e. *Making the church edifice an asylum.* As the pagan temples had been a place of refuge for those who fled to them, it was all the more natural that the Christian churches should be put to this use. By the end of the 4th century, without any special enactment to this effect, the church edifice had very generally come to be regarded as an asylum, particularly the part about the altar. In the year 398, the Emperor *Arcadius*, influenced by his worthless favorite *Eu-*

tropius who was stimulated by hatred towards *Chrysostom*, issued an edict restricting the right of asylum (Cod. Theod. IX. 45, 3); but soon after, Eutropius himself was forced to find a refuge from the fury of the exasperated Gothic troops in Chrysostom's own church. A tragical incident at Constantinople, — occasioned by the non-observance of the right of asylum, in the instance of some slaves who had fled into a church from the cruel treatment of their master, and which ended with the slaying of an ecclesiastic and the suicide of the slaves (Socrat. H. E. VII. 33), — led Theodosius II. to issue a law in 431 (Cod. Theod. IX. 45, 4) by which, upon pain of death for its violation, not only the altar but the entire church edifice in all its parts was made an asylum for all unarmed persons who might have fled into it. Another law, passed in 432, required the clergy, in case slaves had fled to their churches, to notify their masters of the fact within twenty-four hours, and the masters were required upon this notice to receive their slaves back without inflicting punishment upon them.

The independence of the church, in reference to the government, during this period, is seen in an occurrence between *Ambrose*, bishop of Milan, and the Emperor *Theodosius the Great.* Theodosius in his rage, and in violation of his promise to Ambrose, about the year 390 had put to the sword seven thousand of the inhabitants of Thessalonica, on account of an outbreak in their city. Afterwards, he desired to receive the communion at the hands of Ambrose in Milan. The bishop by letter exhorted him first to repent of his sin; but the emperor, under the influence of one of his parasites, still continued to come to church. Ambrose, however, set the matter before the mind of Theodosius in such bold and piercing words that his conscience was reached, and he submitted himself to the discipline of the church, and pledged that hereafter no imperial decision should be put into execution before thirty days had elapsed (See Theodoret, and Rufinus; Paulinus Vita Ambrosii).

§ 70.

THE CLERGY.

The natural and proper official and personal influence of the clergy upon the churches, during this period, degenerated more and more into the arbitrary and arrogant claims of a *Hierarchy;* to which was often opposed the dangerous power and claims of noble, or princely, or imperial laymen.

The *Bishop*, now standing at the head of the clergy, acquired an ever increasing predominance. After the 4th century, the most influential person next to him was the *Archdeacon;* while the *Deacons* themselves, owing to their close connection with the Bishop, obtained high authority, and in some instances even higher than that of the *Presbyters*.[1] The usual number of Deacons still continued to be seven, although in the large cities this limit was exceeded.[2] During this period the office of *Deaconess*, at least in the West, either fell into entire desuetude, or else continued to exist without an official consecration to it. The *new ecclesiastical officers* of this period, particularly in the great cities, were the *Οἰκονόμοι* (Church Treasurers), the *Χαρτοφύλακες* (Keepers of the archives), and the *Notarii* or *Excerptores* (Secretaries of the ecclesiastical convocations). The *appendages* to the old orders of the clergy (§ 30, 2, c.) were the *Parabolani* (Attendants upon the sick), and the *Κοπιᾶται, Fossarii* (Sextons). These latter often constituted a body in the interest of the bishop, and subservient to his purposes.[3]

The new privileges of the clergy greatly increased their numbers in this period, and particularly the number of applicants for the episcopal office, to the injury of the church. On this account, not only was the old church statute revived which excluded neophytes from sacred offices, but the Council of Sardica in 347 ordained (Can. 10) that a person of wealth, or a jurist, might be chosen bishop only in case he had previously discharged in a worthy manner the office of a lector, or deacon, or presbyter. Yet these and similar statutes were often transgressed, and sometimes by no means to the disadvantage of the church.

---

[1] In the Constitutt. Apost. II. 44, the Deacons are designated as *ἀκοὴ καὶ ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ στόμα, καρδία τε καὶ ψυχὴ ἐπισκόπου.* Comp. Jer. Epist. 146.

[2] In the 6th century, the principal church in Constantinople had one hundred deacons (Justinian. Novell. I. 3).

[3] According to Cod. Theod. XVI. 2, 42, 43, there were to be in Alexandria 600 *Parabolani;* and according to Cod. Just. 1. 2. 4, the number of *Copiatae* in Constantinople was to be reduced from 1100 to 950.

The *rules of celibacy* also imposed a restriction of another kind, upon the increase of the numbers of the clergy. A false idea of the priesthood, together with an ascetic spirit, had already in the previous period led to the theory, in certain quarters, that the clergy should be separated from the social and domestic life of the world. The council of *Elvira* in Spain, in 305 (can. 33), had decreed that bishops, presbyters, and deacons, should abstain from marriage intercourse or be deposed. A portion of the council of Nice, in 325, desired to make this decision oecumenical; but a pious Egyptian Confessor, bishop *Paphnutius*, himself a strict ascetic, opposed it, giving prominence to the fact that marriage is a sacred ordinance, and that celibacy is difficult for many to maintain. The result was that the old rule, that the clergymen of the first three grades in case they were unmarried on entering upon these offices should remain so, was retained.[1] The Eastern church continued to abide by this rule, with the exception that after the 5th century bishops were not permitted in any case to live in the marriage connection; but in the West, the Roman bishop *Siricius*, in 385, in a decretal (Epist. ad Himerium Tarraconeus, c. 7—9), affixes deposition as the penalty for clergymen of the first three grades who continue to live in the marriage connection. Nevertheless the clergy in the West still continued to live in marriage, until by degrees this decision of Siricius, which had gradually been extended to the sub-deacons also, became the general practice of the church.

---

[1] The councils of *Neo-Caesarea* and *Ancyra*, in 314, had made a similar enactment.

As respects the *Election* of the clergy during this period, — they were now all chosen by the bishops, the churches formally declaring their concurrence. The bishop himself, except in cases where the imperial influence overruled, was generally chosen by the other bishops of the province, yet with the concurrence of the church, which, in the West, often made a choice alone for itself. The *transfer* of the higher clergy (bishops, presbyters, and deacons), especially of the bishops, from one church to another, and particularly from a smaller to a larger metropolitan church, was now sought to be accomplished by worldly-minded men in various ways, but was strictly forbidden by the Nicene council (can. 15), on the ground that as Christ is indissolubly connected with the universal church, so is the bishop with his particular one. This prohibition was re-affirmed by the council of Antioch in 341 (can. 20), and by the Roman bishop *Damasus* towards the end of the 4th century (Ep. IX. ad Acholium Thessalon. Episc.). Nevertheless this church statute also, — which Gregory Nazianzen about 382 even reckons among those which had for a long time been a dead letter, — was oftentimes violated, and sometimes to meet the actual necessities of the church.

Arrangements for clerical education, during this period, were of various kinds; though by no means corresponding in fitness and efficiency to the weight of the demands made upon the clerical office. Up to the end of the 4th century, the theological school at *Alexandria* (§ 59, 85) did an important work for Egypt, Syria, and the neighboring countries. In this period, the most important theological school was that at *Antioch* (§ 60, 81, 87); and afterwards those at *Edessa* (§ 88) and *Nisibis*. The school at Edessa, an offshoot of the Antiochian, according to Assemann (Bib. Orient. T. III. P. 2. p. 924) was founded by Ephraem Syrus, and was afterwards conducted by Ibas, bishop of Edessa from 436 to 457. It went to ruin among the conflicts of the Persian church, after having been a nursery for the Persian clergy nearly a century. From its fragments arose again, at the close of the 5th century, the well organized school at *Nisibis* in Mesopotamia (Assemani Bib. Orient. T. III. P. 2, p. 927), which at the beginning of the 7th century contained 800 students. In addition to these professional schools, many capable and pious bishops, especially in the West which was very destitute of facilities for theological education, made it their aim to instruct young men for the clerical office, and regarded their own immediate clergy, with whom young men and boys might take their place among the lectors, as a kind of theological seminary. Many persons also, particularly in the latter part of this period, received in the cloisters a suitable biblical and literary preparation for the sacred office, that was, however, characterized by an ascetic cast. Many also took the doubtful course of obtaining a preparation for the sacred office by merely attending the ordinary schools of secular learning, particularly at Athens and Alexandria. Not a few, indeed, supposed that all special preparation might be dispensed with, on the ground that ordination would of itself fit them for the sacred office; so that the thorough views and representations of a *Chrysostom* (*Περὶ ἱερωσύνης*), and an *Augustine* (De doctrina Christiana), concerning the nature of the sacred office, did not exert the influence to which they were entitled.

§ 71.

THE EPISCOPATE AND PATRIARCHATE.

Blondel Traité historique de la primauté en l' eglise.

The hierarchical *Episcopate*, which had already become firmly established in the preceding period (§ 30, 2, and § 32), now acquired a still more universal and exclusive authority, through the rising influence of leading individual bishops (§ 70). With less and less opposition to the prelatical theory, the bishops came to be acknowledged as the sole successors of the Apostles, and the total body of bishops, as the sum and source of all ecclesiastical power and authority. At the same time, however, the claims to superiority over bishops generally, advanced by several of the metropolitan bishops, together with a recognized difference in grade between the metropolitan and country bishops, — a distinction which now appeared with increasing prominence, — exerted a somewhat disturbing influence upon the consolidation of the Episcopate; yet, in the end, this very gradation of office and of power contributed to further the theory of a universal external unity of the church presided over by one visible head.

1. The *Country Bishops*, *Χωρεπίσκοποι*, during this period, sunk into still greater dependency upon the city bishops, and gradually ceased to exist altogether.[1] In their place were substituted, either presbyters appointed by the city bishops over the individual rural churches, or else, particularly in the East, *Visitatores*, *Περιοδευταί*, to visit the country churches in the name and stead of the city bishops.

2. The *Metropolitan Constitution* now assumed a firmer form. The relation of the metropolitans to the other bishops of the province was more closely defined; they ratified the nomination of the latter, and consecrated them; they were now the regular presidents of the provincial synods, which were accustomed (according to Concil. Nic. c. 5) to assemble twice a year, and in which all the more important ecclesiastical, and particularly episcopal, affairs of the province were discussed and settled. Yet the other bishops were protected, by church enactments, in the independent administration of their own particular dioceses, against the encroachments of the metropolitans.

3. Above the metropolitan constitution, still another was formed in this period, — viz.: the *Patriarchal*. Of those metropolitans who in the preceding period had been distinguished by the acquisition of a higher authority (§ 31), three had been formally recognized by the Council of Nice (Can. 6)

---

[1] In the 4th century, the powers of the country bishops were limited in various ways (Concil. Ancyr. c. 13; Concil. Antioch, c. 10); particularly by taking from them the right to ordain presbyters and deacons. The Council of Sardica (Can. 6) forbade the ordination of Chor-bishops.

as primates over several minor bishoprics; viz.: those of *Alexandria*, *Rome*, and *Antioch*. In the course of the 4th century a fourth was added to the number, — the bishop of *Constantinople*. This church had at first been subject to the Thracian metropolitan, but upon Constantine's making Constantinople the residence of the imperial court, it had acquired such importance that the general council of *Constantinople* in 381 (Can. 3) placed it next in rank to that of Rome, — since Constantinople was New-Rome, — connecting with it Thrace, Pontus, and Asia Minor as a befitting ecclesiastical district, and endowing it with the right to receive appeals from other dioceses (Socrat. H. E. V. 8; Conc. Chalced. Act. 15, Can. 9, 28). Thus was formed, — inasmuch as within these larger districts of these higher metropolitans there still continued to be the ordinary metropolitans, — a new class of ecclesiastical officers, first called *Ἔξαρχοι*, and afterwards *Πατριάρχαι*,[1] whose rights and prerogatives were gradually defined and established, and who stood in the same relation to the other metropolitans, that these did to the other provincial bishops. The Patriarchs consecrated the metropolitans, convened the synods of the entire patriarchal diocese, and gave the final decision in all ecclesiastical matters. With the four Patriarchs of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, was formally associated, by the Council of Chalcedon in 451 (Actio VII.), a fifth, — the bishop of *Jerusalem*. This bishop had already been reckoned among the great bishops, at the Council of Nice (Can. 7), not in respect to power but rank; he then gradually drew off from his dependency upon the metropolitan of Caesarea, and at Chalcedon received Palestine as his own independent diocese. This patriarchal constitution naturally, at first, affected the church only within the Roman Empire; and even here, especially in the West, not all the individual churches came into the new arrangement. In North Africa, the bishop of *Carthage* certainly had the highest authority of any, but by no means that of a Patriarch; and the Council of *Hippo Regius*, in 393, expressly declared against the use of the title as worn by a Patriarch. In the East, the bishopric of Cyprus continued independent.

---

[1] This name had previously been applied to all bishops.

4. The *Bishop of Rome*, in this period, favored by political, ecclesiastical, and personal circumstances, began to make his authority felt above the general authority of the Patriarchs. He was, at first, only one of the Patriarchs, and his patriarchal district originally comprised the provinces ruled by the Roman Governor or Vicarius urbis Romanae,—the ecclesiae terrae suburbicariae; i. e. of Middle and Lower Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica. The bishops of Milan, Ravenna, and Aquilea, still asserted their independence of Rome. But now this patriarchal district of the Roman bishop widened almost visibly. More than this, the idea, broached in the preceding period (§ 32), that the Apostle Peter was the representative of the unity of the church, and that the bishop of Rome was his successor, was now still further expanded into the theory of the primacy of the Roman church over all other churches, as the Cathedra Petri,—a theory favored by the fact, that the Roman Sedes Apostolica, the only apostolical see in the West, was also the chief city of the world, and a great capital city of the Christian Roman Empire; and favored also by the increasing complication of ecclesiastical with political affairs. Able Roman bishops were skilful in making use of their relations to the rest of the church, to pave the way for the realization of this theory of primacy. Of these, the most distinguished was *Leo the Great* (440—461),—a man of great force of character, of true Christian feeling, and of scientific spirit, whose weighty words were equally potent to settle a long-continued theological controversy (§ 89, 93), or calm the rage of an Attila.[1] He was the first with clear eye and firm purpose to establish the claims of the Roman see, while he was at the same time the purest-minded of the Roman bishops in this entire period. The rising power of the Roman see was strengthened also by the express declarations of councils and emperors. Amidst the distracting party strifes of the Oriental church in the 4th and 5th centuries, the

---

[1] **Arendt** Leo der Gr. und seine Zeit. **Perthel** Leo I.

word of the Roman bishop, so independent of the secular power, and justly boasting an unstained orthodoxy, must have appeared very weighty, at least to *one* of the Oriental parties. His decision was asked for in humble terms, and often acquired the authority of a judicial verdict; especially when the party with whom he sided were victorious, as was generally the case, — since the Roman see was wont to side with orthodoxy.[1] In addition to this, the Council of *Sardica* in 347 (Can. 3, 5), — a council that had nearly the authority of an oecumenical one, — formally conceded a species of revisory power to the bishop of Rome, in decreeing that if a foreign bishop were dissatisfied with an ecclesiastical decision he might appeal to the bishop of Rome, who might initiate a new investigation of the case in connection with the neighboring bishops, and, if he so pleased, might send a presbyter to the council as his plenipotentiary. And finally, *Leo the Great* obtained a distinct *imperial* declaration in favor of the primacy of the Roman church. The metropolitan, and Vicarius Apostolicus, *Hilary* of Arles, having refused to submit a sentence of deposition which he had passed, to the revision of Rome, and Leo on this account, in 445, having declared that Hilary had forfeited his metropolitan authority, the emperor *Valentinian III.* issued a law, (Leon. Opp. T. I. p. 642, and Theodos. Novell. tit. 24), in which, referring to the dignity of the Apostle Peter, of the city of Rome, and of the Synod of Sardica, he declared that "what was determined by the Sedes Apostolica at Rome should be valid as law, and that every bishop should be obligated to appear before the judgment-seat of the Roman bishop at his summons, — for there could be peace in the church, only when the whole church acknowledged its ruler (rectorem)." It was natural, under these circumstances, that the Roman bishops should more and more feel their power, and assert it. *Innocent I.* claimed that no decision should be made anywhere, without the knowledge of the Romish see, and that in all matters of belief, especially, all bishops ought to make application to St. Peter (Ep. ad Concil. Carthag. a. 446, and ad Conc. Milevit. a. 416). *Leo the Great* declared that "the care of all the churches belonged to himself, as the successor of the apostle Peter, to whom, as the reward of his faith, the Lord had assigned the primacy among the apostles, and upon whom He had founded His church." (Ep. V. ad Metropolitt. Illyr.).

---

[1] Such decisions and *Responsa*, *Epistolae decretales*, were continually issuing from Rome, and furthered the Roman primacy not a little. They are collected in Constant. Epp. Rom. Pontificum a S. Clemente usque ad Innoc. III.

Nevertheless the supreme authority of the Roman bishop, even in the West, was by no means universally acknowledged as yet. Even minds as influential as *Jerome* and *Augustine*, earnest as they were for the unity of the church, and finding its representative in the Cathedra Petri, did not hesitate to insist, in opposition to the rising pre-eminency of the Roman bishop, that the Episcopate *as a whole* was the true successor and vicar of St. Peter.[1] The whole North-African church asserted its independence with emphasis, and with considerable success, particularly during the Pelagian controversy, when the weak and vacillating *Zosimus* sat in the Roman chair, 417–418.[2] During the distractions of the subsequent Vandal invasions, however, the North-African churches were led to lean more towards the Roman patriarchate. The Eastern church was still farther from conceding a pre-eminence of authority to the Roman bishop. The general councils of Nice and Constantinople were entirely free from Romish influence; and although *Theodoret*, bishop of Cyrrhos, in a letter of petition to *Leo the Great*, mentions the grave of Peter and Paul and the political importance of Rome, in proof of the superior authority of the Roman church, yet the general Council of *Chalcedon* in 451 (Act. 15, can. 28) declares that the Patriarch of Constantinople, as the bishop of the capital of the Eastern-Roman Empire, possesses equal rights and dignity with the Roman bishop, and is first in rank after him.

---

[1] Hieron. Epist. 101: Si auctoritas quaeritur, orbis major est urbe. Ubicunque fuerit episcopus, ejusdem est sacerdotii. Omnes apostolorum successores sunt. Augustin. De diversis § 108: Claves non homo unus, sed unitas accepit ecclesiae.—Hinc ergo Petri excellentia praedicatur, quia ipsius universitatis et unitatis ecclesiae figuram gessit.

[2] The Council of Carthage in 418 decreed that whoever should appeal from North-African jurisdiction to any trans-maritime see, should be excommunicated.

During this period, the institution of *General Councils*, Concilia Universalia, *Σύνοδοι οἰκουμενικαί,* by Constantine the Great, in 325, contributed greatly to promote and strengthen the external unity of the church. In theory, they were composed of all the bishops of the church of the Roman Empire (*ἡ οἰκουμένη*), but since this church constituted the germ of the Universal Catholic church, bishops from churches outside of the Empire were readily admitted (Euseb. Vita Const. III. 7).[1] The decisions of these councils, made (theoretically) by a unanimous vote of the bishops in matters of doctrine, and by a majority in all other matters, constituted a body of *Ecclesiastical Law*, universally binding upon the church, at least within the Roman Empire. Two collections of these, from the 6th century, acquired general currency and authority; one by *John Scholasticus*, first a presbyter at Antioch and afterwards patriarch of Constantinople (d. 578), consisting of fifty heads and used by the Greek church; and another by *Dionysius Exiguus*, a Roman Abbot (d. about 556), who, between 498 and 514, combined a former collection of the decisions (Decretales) of the Roman bishops, from the time of bishop Siricius (384) and onward, with the decrees of the more important general councils. This latter was used by the Western church.[2]

---

[1] An imperial edict (sacra imperatoria) summoned the Patriarchs and Metropolitans to meet at a particular place, and these cited the bishops. They travelled at the expense of the emperor. A copy of the gospels was placed in the midst of the assembly. The president, designated either by the emperor, or by particular circumstances, or by the council, in conjunction with the imperial commissioner, conducted the transactions, prepared the statements, and guided the debate to the passage of it as a decree (*ὅρος*). The notaries made a draft of the results, and all the bishops or their proxies subscribed them. These were then sent to the Emperor, as *Gesta* or *ὑπομνήματα,* with the petition that he would confirm them. The emperor then completed the decrees, and dissolved the council.

[2] Both collections, together with other documents pertaining to ancient ecclesiastical law, are to be found in Voëlli et Justelli Bibliotheca juris canonici veteris.

§ 72.

DONATIST SCHISM.

Sources: Optatus (about 368) De schismate Donatistarum Libri VII. Du Pin Monumenta vett. ad Donatistt. hist. pertinentia. Augustinus Contra epistolam Parmeniani Libri III.; De baptismo Libri VII.; Contra literas Petiliani Libri III.; Contra Cresconium Libri IV.; Breviculus collationum cum Donatistis Libri III. Valesius De schismate Donatistt. Norissius Historia Donatistarum.

If the church could in the preceding period insist upon its own essential unity, even in respect to its external form, still less would the Universal Catholic church now yield its claims in this regard, at a time when it still possessed so much of inward vitality, and so firmly asserted the pure doctrine, as in the 4th century. As a consequence, a sharp contest with fanatical Separatism whenever it showed itself was unavoidable. The chief conflict of this kind was with *Donatism;* the most thorough Separatism of the Ancient church, the normal Separatism for all time.

In Northern Africa, the fanatical spirit of the Montanists had propagated itself here and there, and in the Diocletian persecution many under its influence had rushed uncalled into martyrdom; at the same time accusing their more thoughtful and wiser brethren, who opposed them in this, of the fear of man, and the denial of Christ. Against this fanaticism, the bishop *Mensurius* and the arch-deacon *Caecilianus* of Carthage declared themselves, — perhaps with not sufficient mildness and moderation. On the death of Mensurius in 311, Caecilianus was chosen bishop by a great majority of the church, and, on account of the machinations of an opposing party led by *Lucilla* a hypocritical and superstitious woman of wealth, was immediately ordained by *Felix* bishop of Aptunga, before the arrival of the other Numidian bishops, who were usually present upon such an occasion. It was easy now for the party opposed to Caecilianus, with which even the Seniores Plebis of the Carthaginian church sided, to gain over to themselves the Numidian bishops, many of whom had previously belonged to the party opposed to Mensurius, and at whose head stood *Secundus* of Tigisis the primate of Numidia. In accordance with Novatian principles, the ordination of Caecilianus was declared to be invalid, because performed by Felix, whom they accused of being a traditor, and hence meriting excommunication himself. Making similar charges against Caecilianus, and paying no heed to Caecilianus's offer to fall back into the rank of a deacon and be re-ordained by the Numidian bishops, they excommunicated him and proceeded to elect a new bishop for the Carthaginian church. The choice fell upon a Carthaginian lector *Majorinus*, who, in the year 313, was succeeded by the more energetic and active *Donatus Magnus*.[1] Thus the church at Carthage itself, and soon the entire North-African church, were divided into two parties.

The Donatists, — originally denominated pars Majorini but afterwards pars Donati, — were distinguished from their opponents principally by a *theoretical* difference; for *practically*, there was at least as much corruption in the Donatist communion as within the Catholic church. They asserted that the church, in order to be a pure one, must not only in its corporate capacity and as an organized whole maintain the pure apostolical doctrine and practice, — a thing the Catholic church was zealous in professing, — but that as matter of fact every individual member within its pale, without exception, must be pure in doctrine and life. Every church, be it catholic or not in its general character, that contained a single unworthy member in its midst, thereby lost its catholicity, and such a church was the one from which they had separated. In taking this position, the Donatists went counter to the clear teaching of Scripture, which represents the church as a wheat-field in which there are tares, and exhibited a schismatic spirit. But, on the other hand, the Catholic church was liable to run to another extreme, and pay too little regard to that church discipline by which the number of unworthy members should be reduced to as few as possible,—and as matter of fact, even at this time, the church erred palpably in this respect. This first fundamental difference in regard to the nature of the church, led in course of time to several other differences between the Catholic church and the Donatists. The Donatists came to deny all connection between the Church and State,—a principle to which their own practice, particularly at first, was contradictory,—while the Catholics insisted, and that too in an extreme manner, that patronage and protection were due to the Church from the State. The Donatists contended for the fullest freedom of conscience, while the Catholics, in this instance again going too far and trenching upon God's province, would limit this freedom by a reference to the interests of the individual or the church. The Donatists, furthermore, declared that ordination was invalid when performed by one who merited excommunication either on account of doctrine or conduct, while the Catholics declared it to be valid.

---

[1] Who must not be confounded with *Donatus* bishop of *Casae Nigrae*, one of the earliest leaders of the Donatist party.

Soon after the formation of their party, the Donatists were unfavorably treated in the laws then issued by the emperor *Constantine.* Finding themselves condemned without a hearing, they petitioned the emperor for an arrangement whereby the controversy might be decided. Constantine appointed a court of five bishops, to meet at Rome under the presidency of *Melchiades* (Miltiades) bishop of Rome, and try the case of Caecilianus. Ten bishops were chosen by each of the two African parties, to present the charges, and make the defence. Melchiades, with the five bishops appointed by the emperor, and fifteen Italian bishops who had accompanied him, decided, in 313, against the Donatists. The charge against Felix, in particular, was declared to be groundless. The Donatists complained of injustice, and were again condemned by a court summoned at Carthage, in 314, by the emperor, to make a formal judicial investigation. And, lastly, a synod convened by imperial authority at *Arles* decided against the Donatists. They now petitioned the emperor that he would personally examine the matter, and Constantine, after hearing deputies from both parties at Milan in 316, confirmed the previous adverse decisions. Nevertheless, the Donatists remained unchanged in their opinions, and the severe measures that now followed raised their enthusiasm to fanaticism. On this account, the emperor, in a missive to the African bishops in 317, required forbearance towards the Donatists; and upon their declaring, in a petition to him in 321, their steadfast determination to remain in separation from the Catholic church, he granted equal priviliges to both parties, and remained true to this principle till his death. His successor, *Constans*, hoped to win the Donatists over to the church by kindness, and sent them money for distribution as alms; but *Donatus Magnus* sent it back with a passionate protestation against the union of Church and State.[1] The emperor now *commanded*, while continuing his distribution of money, the restoration of the unity of the church in Africa, and the executors of his command were soldiers. The violence and enormities which resulted heated the fanaticism of the Donatists to the utmost, and their *Circumcelliones*,[2] stirred up by the sermons of Donatist bishops to inveigh against the worldliness and show of the dominant church, allowed themselves in acts of violence towards members of the Catholic church, and when violence was employed against *them* in return, frequently put an end to their own lives, in order to become martyrs. These distractions, not at all checked by the exile of the most noted Donatist bishops, continued during the reign of *Constantius*, until *Julian*, readily listening to the petition of the Donatists for justice, granted them toleration. They now came again into possession of their churches, which they subjected to a fanatical purification, and began to enjoy more tranquillity as a party. Very soon, however, dissensions arose among themselves. A Donatist grammarian, named *Tichonius*, sought to effect a reconciliation between the Catholics and the strict Donatists; while, on the other hand, a Donatist deacon *Maximianus* formed a party at Carthage, so extreme as to sustain the same relation to the old strict Donatist party that this did to the Catholic church. While these internal dissensions were occurring in the Donatist party, *Augustine*, then a presbyter and afterwards bishop of Hippo in Numidia, came out in opposition to them with great power of argument. External force, as well as internal divisions, had rebounded without effect from the obstinacy of Separatism. It is not so very much to the disparagement of Augustine's logical talent, that in the end he would, by the moderate use of compulsory measures, force upon the errorists what was for their own welfare. At first a decided opposer of all compulsory measures against the Donatists, he sought to convince by reasoning only. But they feared his superior dialectics, avoided a formal disputation with him, and declined to accept the proposition of the Council of Carthage, in 403, to go into a debate, each side selecting its ablest disputants. The issuing of still severer laws by the State against the Donatists, in 405, Augustine had sought to prevent in a council held at Carthage in 404; but he afterwards changed his ground, during the progress of the contest. He began to defend, in a very acute manner, the opinion that it is right to employ even compulsory means, in order to bring errorists back to their own best interests within that church in which alone is salvation. Nevertheless he continually tempered his theory in practice, and was always urging a great public debate, in which the differences between the Church and the Donatists might be canvassed and settled. This *Collatio cum Donatistis* was at length brought about at Carthage, in 411. Two hundred and eighty-six Catholic bishops with *Augustine* for their spokesman, and two hundred and seventy-nine Donatist bishops with *Petilianus* of Cirta as their ablest speaker, appeared, over whom the imperial commissioner *Marcellinus*, the friend of Augustine, presided. Whether Felix of Aptunga and Caecilianus were actually traditors, and whether the church by containing unworthy members in its communion lost the character of a true Christian church, — questions about which the parties had disputed for a hundred years without coming to an agreement, — these were still, after the settlement of a long series of preliminaries, the main points to be decided. Each party in the conference abode by its own opinion, but the president decided against the Donatists. Still severer laws were now issued by the State against them, and their numbers steadily diminished. They did not suffer greatly from the Vandals (§ 85, 91); but were compelled at length to yield to the Roman edicts and legions. Yet relics of this great party continued to exist until about the year 600, — evincing even in their fragments the power of a mistaken belief, and the wrongs of ecclesiastico-civil persecution.

---

[1] "Quid est imperatori cum ecclesia?"

[2] Fanatical ascetics, "sons of the saints," who roved circum cellas rusticorum, under the lead of *Fasir* and *Axid*.

The after history of the Christian church would have been very different, had the Catholic church, in the Donatist contest, while conscious of the substantial correctness of its own claims, also recognized the element of truth in those of the Donatists; had it learned from this struggle of even a misdirected conscience, to respect the rights of conscience; had it once more resorted to the primitive discipline, and hedged up the way to the multitudes of unconverted persons who were now crowding into it; and had it sought, not indeed by a more artificial external organization but in the exercise of a deeper and simpler faith in God, to render the church more self-subsistent and less dependent upon the State.

SECTION THIRD.

Christian Life and Worship.

CHAPTER FIRST.

CHRISTIAN LIFE.

§ 73.

ANTAGONISTIC TENDENCIES.

As in the former period, so in this, Christianity, wherever it existed in genuineness and sincerity, showed its resplendent effects in a holy life and conduct. The private and public life of a great series of leading church teachers, in whom this period was remarkably fertile, as well as the quiet and retired life of not a few Christian matrons, like *Nonna* the mother of Gregory Nazianzen, *Anthusa* the mother of Chrysostom, and *Monica* the mother of Augustine, exhibited specimens of a profound and beautiful Christian virtue. But at the same time there was much heathenism within the church, covered up under the cloak of merely outward works which had no source in inward piety of heart, and were performed in a self-righteous spirit, as meritorious and atoning. Very many made a merely nominal profession of Christianity, for the sake of the outward benefits connected therewith; and the spirit and conduct of these nominal Christians. instead of evincing the inherent contrariety between the church and the world, only tended to mix and confound the former with the latter. Not a few, disgusted with the corruption within the church, especially in the great cities, were seized with so much the more glowing zeal to live entirely for God, in the mode which they deemed to be the most fitting. Thus was formed the strict ascetic tendency, out of which sprang Monachism. Opposition to the increasing moral corruption, united with a somewhat dimmed perception of evangelical truth, in the earnest-minded, produced a zealous feeling in favor of an anchorite life. And yet such persons found that inward corruption could not be escaped from by retiring into the desert.

§ 74.

MONACHISM.

Palladius (about 420) Historia Lausiaca. The writings hereafter cited of Athanasius, Theodoret, Jerome, and Cassian. Hospinianus De Monachis. Alteserra Asceticôn sc. Origines rei monastici Lib. X. Martene De antiquis monachorum ritibus. Heylot Histoire des Ordres Monastiques. Musson Pragmatische Geschichte der vornehmsten Mönchsorden. Mabillon Annales Ordinis sancti Benedicti. Dacherius et Mabillon Acta Sanctorum Ordinis sancti Benedicti.

1. *Monachism in the East.* Monachism, a tendency not intrinsically Christian, but Oriental, climatic, and unreasoning, and which was somewhat purified by Christianity itself, flourished chiefly in the East. There were already in the preceding period some Christian ascetics (§ 35), but the first example of an anchorite, *Paul of Thebes*, stood almost alone and without influence. The Egyptian *Antony* of Coma (b. 251, d. 356) was the father of Christian hermit-life or monachism; a man lacking in strictly scientific culture, but full of living zeal for Christianity, and endowed with a rich and truly sanctified mind. From childhood withdrawing from all plays and sports, an orphan at the age of eighteen, he was so affected, when in early manhood, by hearing the story of the rich young man read from the Gos-

pels in church, that he divided his landed possessions among the inhabitants of his village, distributed his other property among the poor, and began to live as an ascetic in the vicinity of his native place, confirming himself in his new course of life by visiting other approved ascetics. Tormented here by inward temptations, which in his heated fancy he deemed to be demoniacal, and which he afterwards learned to despise and overcome by faith, he withdrew to a retired cave which had been used for a tomb, where his internal conflicts increased to such a degree that he was one day found in a swoon, and brought back to his village. Having recovered, he afterwards lived twenty years among the dilapidated ruins of a castle. Here in this solitude, his character was matured by prayer, and silent contemplation of nature, of himself, and of the grace of God in Christ. He now yielded to the entreaties of others, to become their teacher and counsellor in spiritual things; although he finally exchanged his residence for a more distant retreat in the mountains, in order to escape from the admiration and disturbance of the multitude. This locality was henceforth the proper theatre of the eremite life and labors of Antony, where he raised his own scanty food with his own hands, and from which he sometimes, though very rarely, sallied out into the great turmoil of the world. Thus, in the year 311, when *Maximin* renewed the persecution in Egypt, he appeared at Alexandria, encouraged and strengthened the confessors before the tribunals, waited upon prisoners in their prisons, and no one ventured to lay hands upon him. The profound veneration for him continued to increase, and all persons of like spirit gathered about him. He recommended them to prayer and manual labor. Men of all ranks, learned and unlearned, visited him in his solitude, and sought from him counsel and consolation. No embittered person went away without being reconciled with his adversary; no mourner without being comforted. Not seldom did his prayers bring down the healing power of God upon the sick and diseased. He did not boast of this, neither did he murmur when he was not heard, but praised God in both alike. Even the emperor Constantine, together with his family, applied by letter to him, as to a father, and Antony, unmoved by the honor, reminded the emperor in his answer, that Christ is the King of kings. In the year 325 Antony appeared again at Alexandria, chiefly for the purpose of counteracting Arianism which was being furthered by the civil power, and in a few days, more heathen were converted to Christ than had been in a year before. The last days of his life he spent in profound silence and stillness. He departed peacefully and joyfully, in the one hundred and fifth year of his age, enjoining that the place of his burial should be kept a secret, in order to prevent the superstitious veneration of his remains.[1]

The illustrious example of Antony found many imitators. The solitudes of Egypt were filled with eremites, — particularly the mountains of Nitria by the zeal of *Ammonius*, and the desert of Scetis; as were those of Syria, in the desert of Gaza, by the zeal of *Hilarion*.[2] Communities of hermits, *λαῦραι*, were formed, who lived together in their cells under an overseer; of which, one formed by *Pachomius* (d. 348) upon Tabenna, an island in the Nile, was noted, — containing even in the life time of its founder seven thousand members, who were increased to fifty thousand within a century.

The growing zeal for a monk's life, whereby many were led into it from mere vanity and sloth, began to operate unfavorably upon the State as well as the Church. These evil effects, the emperor *Valens*, in 365, endeavored to check, by issuing a law commanding that all monks who had become such from mere slothfulness and a desire to escape from civil duties should be forcibly expelled (Cod. Theodos. XII. 1, 63). In the Church, the evil effects of Monachism were seen not only in the ascetic theory of morality, which ministered to spiritual pride, and contradicted the doctrine of gratuitous justification, but also in the violent fanaticism into which many monks fell. The self-tortures of the proud and self-worshipping ascetic, in some instances, exceeded all bounds, —as the examples of a Valens in Palestine (Pallad. Hist. Laus. c. 31), of a Heron of Alexandria (ib. c. 39), of a Ptolemaus (c. 33), and others, show,—and ended not seldom in insanity (Hist. Laus. c. 33, 95, et alia). Much corruption also resulted from the rise of associations that were wholly and merely fanatical. In Mesopotamia, about 360, troops of wandering mendicant monks were formed, who in their so-called ascetic perfection claimed to be free from the yoke of the law, would follow only the impulses of the Spirit, and renounced every species of labor as sinful, because pertaining to earthly things and degrading to the higher spiritual life. These were denominated the *'Ενϑουσιασταί*; sometimes also *Εὐχῖται*, because rejecting all the external ordinances of the church, and declaring the sacraments themselves to be matters of indifference, they absorbed themselves in inward prayer alone, deeming this to be the pinnacle of Christian perfection.[1] In Pontus, *Eustathius*, from the year 355 onward bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, appeared as the defender of monkish life, and servants there left their masters, husbands their wives, and mothers their children, boasting of a special holiness, and acknowledging no married priest as an authorized one. The *Synod of Gangra* in Paphlagonia, between 362 and 370, opposed these disorders with decision and energy (§ 75).

---

[1] See the Vita Antonii by **Athanasius**; translated in the Bibliotheca Sacra, 1844. Compare **Böhringer** Kirchengeschichte in Biographieen. Th.I Abth. 2.

[2] **Jerome** Vita Hilarionis.

In order to avoid the fanatical influences of Monachism, and to retain what was salutary in it, the bishops of this period, particularly *Basil the Great* of Neo-Caesarea in the 2d half of the 4th century, following the example of *Pachomius*, sought to renovate the declining and degenerating institution, and introduce more of a regular order into it. Instead of the solitary hermit-life in a cell, the monks were now often associated together, under systematic regulations, in great edifices (Coenobia, from *κοινός* and *βίος*, Monasteria).

---

[1] They were also called *Messalians*, from the Chaldee מְצַלֵּין, signifying the same as Εὐχῖται,—under which name they continued to exist into the 6th century. See Theodoret. H. E. IV. 10, 12; Fabb. Haer. IV. 11; Epiphanius Haeres. 86.

Here each one had his particular routine of labor assigned to him, which he performed with the monk's regularity and obedience, under the supervision of an Abbas (*Αββᾶς* from the Syriac), or *'Αρχιμανδρίτης*, — the proceeds of the labor going into the common chest.[1] By means of this coenobite arrangement, many of the wild offshoots of Monachism were pruned away, and it became possible, in many instances, to derive from Monachism a permanent practical good. Only in this way, could the scientific and biblical knowledge, as well as the Christian piety, of distinguished monks, like *Nilus* and *Isidore of Pelusium* (§ 88), pass over among the common people, and become a general blessing, by means of the cloister schools for children, and the cloister seminaries for the clergy, — not to mention the various benefits of an external character, which flowed out from the monastery to the poor, to travellers, and sometimes to entire districts suffering from disease or famine.[2]

Thus there arose in the East, in the course of the 4th century, two principal classes of monks: *Anchorites*, who lived each individual in his own cell, either singly or else in a collection of cells (*λαῦραι*); or *Coenobites*, who were monks in the stricter sense, living in a large edifice, either in city or country, under systematic regulations. Among the *Anchorites*, there were not wanting examples of an ascetic heroism worthy of a more rational aim and end. In the 5th and 6th centuries, and even to the 12th, individuals appeared among them, who won great veneration by their extraordinary ascetic practices and efforts. Particularly distinguished among these, were the so-called *Stylites;* of whom the first was *Simeon Stylites*, at Antioch about 420, who for thirty years preached repentance to the awe-struck multitude, from the top of a pillar sixty feet high. Among the Coenobites, the most distinguished were the *'Ακοίμητοι*, *Watchers*, so denominated from their nocturnal worship; for whom, in 463, the Roman

---

[1] Coenobia were also established for females, as early as the time of Pachomius.

[2] The Egyptian cloisters, e. g. provided the unfruitful Libyan district with fruit (Cassian. Institut. X. 22, and Pallad. Hist. Laus. c. 76). The Nitrian cloisters refreshed the travellers of their region (Hist. Laus. c. 6).

Studius founded a very renowned cloister at Constantinople (*Studium*, cloister of the *Studites*). Besides these two principal classes of Anchorites and Coenobites, a third is also spoken of; viz: the *Sarabaites* as they were called in Egypt, or the *Remoboth* as they were named in Syria. These were probably the relics of the earlier Christian ascetics, and lived in the neighborhood of cities, in small companies, without strict regulations, and without a superintendent.

2. *Monachism in the West.* The West was not so naturally inclined to Monachism as the East. It cost an effort to introduce it into the Western church, and one that succeeded only through the united endeavors of the most distinguished church teachers.

Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, first made the Western church acquainted with Monachism, during his exile in Gaul in 336 and 337, and his "Life of Antony" was soon translated into Latin. After him, many Occidental bishops and Church teachers labored zealously in behalf of monachism,—in Italy, at the close of the 4th century, *Ambrose* of Milan and the presbyter *Jerome*, the latter of whom during his residence in Rome induced many Roman men and women into monkish life, but was on this account compelled to flee from the city (§ 86); in North Africa, at the beginning of the 5th century, *Augustine*, who sought in all ways to render Monachism of benefit to the church; in Gaul, *Martin* bishop of Tours from 375 to 400, whose example continued to exert great influence after his death, and *John Cassian*, trained among the Egyptian monks, who founded two cloisters in Marseilles, about 410, and became extensively known by his *Collationes* (sketches of the spiritual conversation of Oriental monks), and his *Institutiones* (a work on the rules of cloisters). The cloisters in Southern Gaul became very renowned, and in the 5th century men like *Vincent of Lerins* and *Faustus of Rhegium* issued forth from them. Nevertheless the Occidental Monachism would not have withstood the storms that accompanied the migration of nations, but would have become more and more rude and gone to ruin in the end, had it not received from the genius of an individual of the 6th century a firm form of organization that secured its perpetuity amidst all the external distractions of the time, and made it the medium of imparting a Christian civilization to the savage populations of the 7th and 8th centuries. *Benedict*, born at Nursia in Umbria 480 (d. 543), by his system of monastic regulations projected in 529, introduced law and order into the entire Monachism of the Western church. Having in early life received a literary training at Rome, he had been led, by his disgust at the corruption of morals in that city, and by his inclination to a contemplative life, while still a youth, to take up his abode as a hermit in a grotto at Subiacum. Having lived unknown in this manner for three years, he was discovered by some shepherds. He now became an object of veneration, and though still a young man, was made the abbot of a cloister; but the savage and undisciplined manners of the monks drove him back to his solitude. Men of all ranks and races now crowded about him, to put themselves under his tuition. He founded twelve cloisters, and distributed his monks among them. Disputes with a neighboring priest, named Florentius, induced him to leave the district. Attended by a few of his pupils, he betook himself to the ruins of an old castle on a mountain in Campania, *Castrum Cassinum*, and in the year 529 founded the famous monastery of *Monte Cassino*. His monastic regulations required a novitiate of a year before reception into the number of the monks, and obligated the monk by an oath to reside constantly in the cloister, to punctually obey his superiors and the abbot in particular as the vicegerent of Christ, and to live according to the rules of the institution. In Benedict's system, spiritual studies were associated with corporeal labor, particularly the cultivation of the soil. The education of children and youth, together with the conversion of the remainders of the pagan populations which were found in the district of Cassinum, were also chief objects with Benedict, and in these respects he was the forerunner of the founders of the great mediaeval monasteries. When, in the year 538, the Ostrogoth civilian *Cassiodorus*[1] withdrew from the storms of public life, and entered the Benedictine cloister at Vivarium in Lower Italy, he sought to direct the attention of the monks to the pursuits of learning as far as possible, in order to save declining science to the church. — The Benedictine reformation of Monachism soon found an entrance into Gaul, Spain, and other countries.

---

[1] Comp. § 6, 1.

§ 75.

OPPOSITION TO THE ASCETIC SPIRIT.

Although the ascetic spirit was a ruling one in this period, yet opposition to it was not wanting. This opposition did not spring merely from that frivolous and worldly spirit, common in every age, which is averse to all earnestness in religion, but here and there from a more correct insight into the nature of Christian morals. To this latter species belong the decrees of the *Council of Gangra*,[1] between 362 and 370, which expressed its regard for Monachism as a means of Christian culture, but declared marriage to be a lawful and sacred relationship, asserted the compatibility of a Christian life with the possession of worldly goods, and pronounced the anathema, both upon those who had embraced Monachism because they looked upon marriage and social life as sinful in themselves, and upon those who refused to attend the administration of the Christian ordinances and sacraments by a married clergyman.[2] Many individual minds also shared in this opposition to the false austerity of the time, — as, for example, *Helvidius* at Rome, and *Bonosus* bishop of Sardica, towards the close of the 4th century, who not only arrayed themselves against the views of the church respecting celibacy and monastic life, but also against the doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary, and the exaggerated veneration which now began to be paid to her in the church (§ 80). The most distinguished individual of this class, was the Romish monk *Jovinian* (about 388), — a man of a truly genuine and enlightened reformatory spirit, though in some respects of one-sided tendency, — who opposed the notion of the meritoriousness of monastic life, fasting, and celibacy of the clergy, and who attacked not merely single ascetic principles, but the entire ascetic tendency in the church, the root of which he would find in a misapprehension of the true nature of Christian virtue, and a forgetfulness of the necessary inward connection between faith and works. At the same time, by his obscure and paradoxical manner of expressing himself,[1] he furnished some ground for the misapprehension of his real opinions, and for suspicions in regard to them, which led to his being charged with holding heretical views, and to his excommunication by *Siricius* bishop of Rome, and afterwards by *Ambrose* bishop of Milan, to whom he had betaken himself. He was also most violently attacked by *Jerome*, in his work *Adversus Jovinianum* (in 392), and in his *Apologia*. Of similar views and spirit with Jovinian, was the Gallic presbyter *Vigilantius*, at Barcelona (about 404), who in strong terms opposed, as unwise, the practice of the immediate distribution of one's entire possessions among the poor, the useless life of a monk in his cell, the flight into a cloister from conflict with the world, and clerical celibacy, as in reality producing impurity instead of chastity. Vigilantius, also, found an opponent in *Jerome* (*Adv. Vigilantium* in 406; Comp. the *Ep. ad Ripuarium* in 404).[2] Yet, on the other hand, *Augustine* felt called upon to take ground against the extreme views of Jerome, in his work *De bono conjugali*, in which he recognized the element of truth in Jovinian's tendency, and attacked the notion of a mere *opus operatum*. Probably in connection, moreover, with Jovinian's residence of several years in Milan after his excommunication in 390, some monks in that place, — e. g. *Sarmatio* and *Barbatianus*, — adopted his views respecting the meritoriousness of celibacy. They left their cloister, and went to Vercelli, whither Ambrose sent a letter warning the church against them.

---

[1] This council was, indeed, a small one, consisting of only from 12 to 16 bishops.

[2] Fuchs Bibliothek der Kirchenversammlungen, Th. II. S. 305.

---

[1] As, e. g., that one who has once been regenerated cannot actually commit sin.

[2] Walch De Vigilantio haeretico-orthodoxo.

CHAPTER SECOND.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

§ 76.

ASSEMBLAGES FOR WORSHIP.

The original simplicity and freedom in the mode of conducting public worship was now displaced by more complex methods, and stricter regulations.

Great use was now made of music, and a class of *Cantatores*, *ψαλταί*, appears in connection with the Lectores. In Antioch, the custom was first established of singing in responses, and was thence transferred into the Western church, by *Ambrose* of Milan, and afterwards by *Hilary* of Poictiers, both of whom also composed spiritual songs that were used in worship, though with some opposition. The music of the church, particularly in the East, occasionally assumed a theatrical character. The other parts of public worship were: prayer; reading of portions of scripture arranged in part with reference to the church feasts, and for the benefit principally of those who could not read; the sermon, which in the East, certainly, was not infrequently applauded by clapping;[1] and the administration of the Supper.

Until the rite of infant baptism became completely universal, the public worship of the church was divided into two principal parts: the *Λειτουργία τῶν κατεχουμένων*, *Missa*

---

[1] Rebuked, however, by *Chrysostom*, Homil. 30 in Act.; *Augustine* Sermo LXI. § 13; see *Eusebius* VII. 30.

catechumenorum,[1] consisting of the reading of Scripture and prayer, a didactic service in which all the catechumens might engage (§ 39, 1, and § 79); and the *Λειτουργία τῶν πιστῶν, Missa fidelium*, intended rather to represent the communion of believers, and including the sacrament of the Supper with the preparatory prayers of consecration, in which only the baptized could take a part. But this distinction, it is evident, would disappear, as fast as the baptism of infants ceased to be delayed (under the impression that baptism conferred grace, and that grace lost after baptism was lost forever), and the rite came to be generally administered; so that in the 4th century both of these principal parts of worship were already blending more and more into a common unity.

A characteristic difference between this period and the former is seen in the show and splendor which took the place of the earlier simplicity in worship. There was now far more wealth in the church, and it was expended upon clerical vestments, frankincense, wax tapers, etc., though not without occasional remonstrances of earnest minds against this incoming of heathenism. Art was now much more employed in religion, not merely in the music and oratory of the church, but in all varieties of external ornamentation.

§ 77.

CHURCH EDIFICES.

The influence of Art was seen especially in the construction of *Church Edifices*, which nevertheless were built with reference to the purposes of worship, and not merely of fine art. Instead of the first plain rooms for assembling, splendid churches were now built. They generally consisted of three parts: the front court, *πρόναος*, called from its oblong form *νάρϑηξ*, *ferula*, where the catechumens stood, and where Jews and Pagans also might be present during sermon;[1] next, the temple proper, the general place of assembling for all baptized persons, the *ναός*, or, from its resemblance, *navis*, *ναῦς ἐκκλησίας*, containing the pulpit, *ὁ ἄμβων*;[2] and last, the sanctuary, *βῆμα, ἄδυτον, ἅγιον, τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων*, *sacrarium*, *sanctuarium*, the *χορός*, separated from the rest of the ship by lattice work, *κιγκλίδες*, *cancelli*, from its form also called *concha*, to which only the clergy had access, and where were the altar, *ἁγια τράπηζα*, *ϑυσιαστήριον*, *altare*, *mensa sacra*, and the seats of the clergy, *καϑέδραι*, comprising the *ϑρόνος ἐπισκόπου*, and those of the inferior clergy, *σύνϑρονοι*.[3] Churches commonly had side buildings, in particular the baptistery, *βαπτιστήριον*, with a laver *κολυμβήϑρα*, *piscina*.[4]

---

[1] *Missa* ("*missa est ecclesia*"), in the Latin of that time, signified as well as *missio* the dismissal of the assembly. The modern "Mass" is derived from it.

Against the use of representations of religious objects, by *pictures* or *images*, in Christian churches, only here and there an individual voice was raised, and even these were silent by the close of the 4th century. When *Constantia*, the sister of Constantine, asked *Eusebius* of Caesarea for an image of Christ, he objected to all use of images as something intrinsically pagan, and exhorted the princess to derive from the Gospels such an image of Christ as could not be represented in colors; and the aged bishop *Epiphanius* of Salamis in Cyprus, towards the end of the 4th century, tore down with his own hands an image in the front court of a Palestine church, saying that such use of images was contrary to the divine law. In the course of the 5th century the custom had come to be general, and not unmingled with a superstitious feeling, to employ images in the churches and particularly in the chapels dedicated to martyrs, as an aid to devotion, and the instruction of the uneducated. The *sign of the cross* had been employed very early, both in the social and the public life of the church, but in this period its use was very greatly multiplied (Comp. Chrysost. Homil. ad Jud. et Graec. Opp. T. 1. p. 571). In the 4th century, the figure of the cross appeared in different places within the church edifice, particularly upon the altar (Sozomen. II. 3); and still later the image of the Crucified, or the crucifix, took the place of this.

---

[1] Before the front court there was an area, *αἴϑριον*, *αὐλη*, *atrium*, *area*, with a vessel of water (*κρήνη*, *cantharus*), in order to wash the hands before entering the church, after the ancient Jewish custom.

[2] Primarily for the lectors and singers, and used by the preacher when the sermon was not delivered from the bishop's seat, or the steps of the altar.

[3] Only the clergy partook of the Sacrament within the sanctuary. The emperor was an exception to the time of Ambrose.

[4] Church towers were not built till the latter part of the middle ages.

§ 78.

CHRISTIAN FESTIVALS.

Sunday was now more and more observed externally, as the day of sacred rest for the entire population of the State. The custom of abstaining from secular avocations upon this day, which had long before been prevalent in the church, now became an ecclesiastical requirement by the 29th canon of the Council of *Laodicea* (between 360 and 364). This council also recommended laboring upon Saturday (the Jewish Sabbath). The emperor Constantine had ordered the cessation of all judicial procedures upon Sunday (§ 69, 2, a.), and had also forbidden all military exercises upon this day (Euseb. Vit. Const. IV. 18). He had also prescribed a Sunday prayer for the whole army (Euseb. Vit. Const. IV. 19, 20), which indeed contained in it nothing distinctively Christian, but the monotheism of which had already been adopted by the more thoughtful pagans of that time. A later imperial law, of 386 (Cod. Theod. VIII. 8, 3), strictly forbade all civil transactions upon Sunday, as "sacrilegium," and a still later one, of 425 (Cod. Theod. XV. 5, 2), prohibited Sunday spectacles.

The festival of *Easter* was preceded by the season of penitence and fasting called *Quadrigesima*, although it was only gradually that it became forty days in duration; a season certainly fitted by its striking silence and abstinence to sober and solemnize wordly minds, but which was now taking on the character of an opus operatum. The Easter festival itself was divided into two parts. The *first* part was the *Πάσχα σταυρώσιμον,* the "Great Week," which began with Palm-Sunday (commemorative of Christ's triumphal entry into Jerusalem), and ended with the "Great Sabbath." This whole period of seven days was observed with daily morning and evening service, profound stillness, cessation from all civil business, fasting, and acts of benevolence and mercy. The fifth day in this series, *ἡ ἁγία πέμπτη, Dies Coenae,* Maundy Thursday, was observed in commemoration of the institution of the Lord's Supper in a somewhat more joyous manner, by partaking of the Sacrament without the usual fast connected with it. The sixth day in this series, *ἡ παρασκευή* or *ἡμέρα τοῦ σταυροῦ,* Good Friday, was kept with the very strictest fasting and solemnity, the osculum pacis itself being refrained from. The seventh day in this series, the "Great Sabbath," *τό μέγα σάββατον,* was the favorite day for baptism; the baptized appeared in their white robes, and in the evening all the cities were illuminated. The Easter Vigils were now observed, when all poured into the churches with lights in their hands, and with song, prayer, reading of scripture-lessons, and sermon, waited for the breaking of Easter-morn. At the dawning of Easter Sunday, the stillness of the midnight vigils was interrupted by Christian greetings and congratulations, and the eight days that followed constituted the *second* part of the great festival: the *Πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον, πασχάλιος ἑορτή.* The eighth and last day in this second series, was called the Octave of Easter, *Pascha clausum, ἀντίπασχα, Dominica in albis,* White Sunday, because those who had been baptized on the preceding "Great Sabbath" (*Novi, Infantes*) now laid aside their white garments, and appeared with the rest of the church, after having been solemnly exhorted by the bishop to be faithful to their baptismal vows. Thus, the two parts of the Easter celebration constituted a period of fifteen days, reckoning from Palm Sunday to White Sunday inclusive. The dispute of the preceding period respecting the *time of celebrating*

Easter (§ 38) had now been settled by an initiatory decision of the *Council of Arles* in 314, and by a final decision of the *Council of Nice* in 325. The Judaistic usage of the Asia-Minor church was rejected by the Nicene council, but a small party continued to retain it, and separated themselves from the Catholic church. They bore the name of *Τεσσαρεςκαὶ δεκατῖται, Quartodecimani;* because they asserted that the 14th day of Nisan was the proper beginning of the Easter festival. The astronomical calculation and publication of the time of Easter was committed by the Council of Nice to the bishop of Alexandria, but this was not assented to, at first, by the Roman church. Hence, owing to a difference in the calculations, Easter was celebrated upon different Sundays in different provinces; the divergence between Rome and Alexandria, in the year 387, being a month and four days. At length, the Alexandrine computation, — which the patriarch was accustomed to publish to his diocese, on the feast of Epiphany each year, by a circular letter, *libelli paschales*, *γράμματα ἑορταστικά,* — was adopted in the 6th century by the Roman church, through the influence of *Dionysius Exiguus*, after a part of the Western church had previously accepted it.

The fiftieth day after Easter was, in this period, observed more and more definitely and generally as *Pentecost*, *Πεντηκοστή*, in the strict sense, in commemoration of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. At the same time, the whole period of fifty days between Easter and Pentecost proper, called *Quinquagesima*, was solemnly observed; in the Eastern Church, by divine service, in which the Acts of the Apostles were read as the scripture-lessons, and by the prohibition by law, in 425, of public amusements. Of these fifty days, the feast of the *Ascension*, *'Αναληψις*, *Ascensio*, was celebrated with especial care.

Christmas now obtained universal observance, and first in the Western Church. The custom of selecting the 25th of December as the day of Christ's nativity, which began to prevail at Rome about the middle of the 4th century,[1] became more and more general. It has been supposed that the church was led to the choice of this day, in particular, by the desire of withdrawing Christians from the observance of a series of pagan festivals which occurred at this time,—such as the *Saturnalia* commemorative of the golden age, with the *Strenae* or giving of presents, and the *Sigillaria* or children's festival. But it may be urged, on the other hand, that it was by no means the theory of the ancient Christian church, to fuse pagan with Christian ideas and usages, in order to promote Christianity. On the contrary, the church was wont to appoint days of penitence, fasting, and prayer, in direct antagonism to the riotous festivals of the heathen. The observance of Christmas was not introduced at Antioch till after 376 (Chrysostom. Hom. in diem nat. Christ.), and into Egypt not until about the year 431 (Act. Conc. Eph.). In this latter country, as in many others, the nativity of Christ had been celebrated in connection with the feast of the Epiphany.

---

[1] In the time of bishop Liberius, after 350 (Ambros. De Virginib. III. 1).

The observance of the feast of *Epiphany*, *τὰ Ἐπιφάνια τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὰ Θεοφάνια, τὰ Φῶτα Χριστοῦ*, commemorative of the manifestation of the Messianic dignity and divine majesty of Christ at his baptism in Jordan, likewise spread from the East to the West, during this period. In the Western church, this feast had another reference, in addition to that already mentioned; viz. to the manifestation of Christ as the Redeemer of the heathen world, made to the wise men from the East. Hence it was also called the feast of the *Primitiae Gentium*, and also came into a closer connection with the Christmas festival (Augustin. Sermo. 203). Still a third reference was sometimes given to the feast of the Epiphany, by making it commemorative of the first manifestation of Christ's miraculous power, at Cana. Hence it was sometimes called *Dies natalis virtutum Domini.* The first reliable trace of the observance of the feast of Epiphany in the West is found about 360, in Ammianus Marcellinus XXI. 2; and of its threefold significance, in Maximus Tauriensis, at the beginning of the 5th century (Homil. 6. 7). Though this ancient Christian festival has fallen into disuse, it is nevertheless a very significant index, in its threefold reference to facts in the Redeemer's life, of a church that had, and desired to have, a historical Christ who was more than a mere idea, — who was a living manifestation, and a palpable display of Deity.

§ 79.

CELEBRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS.

The *Celebration of the Sacraments*, like the entire worship of the church generally, was accompanied with more and more splendor, and reduced to a more precise form; while at the same time the elements of superstition, which had begun to mix with the original and pure practice, now showed themselves in a more distinct and corrupting manner.

1. *Baptism.* The necessity of *Infant baptism* had already been very generally acknowledged in theory, as early as the 3d century; but it was not until the middle of the 5th century, that the exhortations of the most distinguished church teachers to the actual practice of the rite became generally effectual. The Eastern church was slowest to be influenced by them. Previous to this time, many had delayed baptism until some pressing outward calamity, or perhaps a dangerous sickness, occurred; imagining that thus the forgiveness of sins was made sure at last.[1]

Respecting the manner of *instructing the Catechumens*, preparatory to baptism, the *Catecheses* of Cyril of Jerusalem, written before 350 while he was still a presbyter, and the work of Augustine *De catechizandis rudibus*, give information. The Catechumens, as in the latter part of the preceding period, were still divided into three classes: the *ἀκροώμενοι, audientes.* who might be present only at the reading of the scripture-lessons and at sermon, and were dismissed when the consecrating prayers commenced (Comp. § 76); secondly the *γονυ-*

---

[1] Upon the occasion of a great public calamity, all classes hurried to be baptized (Chrysost. Hom. 41 in Act.).

κλίνοντες, *genuflectentes* (also *κατηχούμενοι* in the narrower sense), who might be present at certain prayers offered specially for them, but only in a kneeling posture; and lastly, the *φωτιζόμενοι, competentes* (*sc. baptismum*), who were candidates proposed for the baptismal rite.

Some symbolical usages were conjoined with the *baptismal act*, in this period, which are still observed by the Roman-Catholic church. Anointing with oil (§ 39, 1) was now of two kinds: one preparatory to baptism, and the other strictly chrismatic and connected with confirmation; the first was applied to the head only, the last, as emblematic of entire consecration, to the forehead, ears, nose, and breast. — In addition to Easter and Pentecost, the favorite *times for baptism*, the Greek church had already added the feast of Epiphany, and in the West the Spanish church now administered baptism upon this and other festival days. The Roman bishop *Siricius* (in his Decretal to bishop Himerius of Tarraco) issued the first distinct specification in respect to the time of baptism. He ordered that the rite should be administered to children immediately after birth, and to all others, special cases excepted, only upon Easter and Pentecost.

2. *The Lord's Supper.* The celebration of this sacrament was accompanied, in this period, with a very elaborate and detailed liturgy, the object of which was, to express the communion of believers with Christ and with each other, in their common partaking of the body and blood of the Redeemer. The service was preceded by the call of the deacon, excluding catechumens, and all unbelievers, heretics, hypocrites, unreconciled persons, etc., from participation in it.[1] Then followed the solemn consecration, *ἁγιασμός*, by a eucharistic prayer into which Christ's words of institution were introduced; after which the bishop taking up the bread and wine, till now concealed by a curtain hung before the altar, showed them to the church as the body and blood of the Lord (*ἀναφορά, προσφορά, oblatio*). During the participation in the emblems first by the clergy, and afterwards by the church,[2] it was cus-

---

[1] Constitutt. Apost. VIII. 12.

[2] Const. Apost. VIII. 13.

tomary to sing the 34th, or the 9th, or some other psalm, and the minor doxology.

But in and by this more elaborate liturgical arrangement, the idea was more and more distinctly formed, of the sacrament as a *sacrificial offering* by the Christian priest. The church prayers now immediately followed the consecration, and among these, those for the dead were regarded of so much importance that the sacrament of the Supper already began to be looked upon as an *oblatio pro mortuis*. Some of the fathers, as Chrysostom, e. g., found cause to complain of the neglect of the communion on the part of many Christians, especially in the larger cities in the East. Many partook of the sacrament only once in a year, on one of the great festivals. In the Roman, Spanish, and Alexandrine churches, on the other hand, a species of daily communion was somewhat common in the 4th century.

The *Agape* had already fallen into disuse in many places, in the preceding period. It had now entirely lost its original signification, in case it was observed at all; being entirely separated from the sacrament of the Supper, and merely a meal given by the richer church members to their poorer brethren.[1] For this reason, the Council of Laodicea between 360 and 364, and of Hippo in 393, forbade the observance of the Agape within the walls of a church. After the close of the 4th century, the love-feast was gradually given up, on account of the increasing number of Christians.

§ 80.

VENERATION OF SAINTS. OF MARTYRS, OF MARY; PILGRIMAGES.

1. The *veneration of martyrs and saints*, which originally (§ 38) occupied only an entirely subordinate place, and even this for the most part with an altogether different significance, now constituted one of the principal parts of Christian wor-

---

[1] August. Contra Faust. XX. 20.

ship. The memory of great teachers in the church, who had been illuminated by the spirit of God and made illustrious by martyrdom, was now celebrated by public ecclesiastical solemnities. The feast in memory of the *martyrdom of Peter and Paul* (June 29th) was one of the principal festivals in Rome; and that in memory of *Stephen*, the first Christian martyr, was observed on the day following Christmas (Dec. 26th). At the same time, this reverence for martyrs and saints, not to mention their relics, assumed during this period, more and more, a superstitious form. Narratives and reports of miracles, particularly of wonderful cures that were said to have occurred at the graves of martyrs, and in the chapels erected over them, or upon contact with the relics of some holy man, induced many to put up prayers to the saints, in churches dedicated to their memory, for their intercession in cases of emergency, particularly of dangerous disease, and, in instances of recovery, to hang up in these chapels gold or silver images (*ἀναϑήματα*) of the parts that had been healed. The exhortations of leading church teachers, who sought to turn the attention away from the finite instrument to the infinite author, and from the superstitious veneration of the saint to the imitation of his virtues, could not prevent the mingling of many pagan ideas with this excessive reverence for departed saints. — With vehement and unsparing polemics, the Spanish presbyter *Vigilantius*, at the beginning of the 5th century, came out in opposition to this whole tendency (Comp. § 75); to whom *Jerome* replied.

2. This superstitious tendency showed itself in a yet more remarkable manner, in reference to the *Virgin Mary*. In the 4th century, a number of Thracian women in Arabia, the *Collyridianians*, *Κολλυριδιανοί* (Epiphan. Haer. 78, 79), as the priestesses of Mary, rendered to her an idolatrous worship by mingling with the celebration of the sacrament of the Supper superstitious practices borrowed perhaps from the thesmophoric feast of Ceres.[1] But this extreme of adoration was, at this time certainly, decidedly condemned by the

---

[1] They carried about in chariots cakes or wafers, *κολλύρια*, *κολλύριδες*, consecrated to Mary, which they afterwards ate. Compare Münter De Collyridianis.

church generally, although the reverence for the mother of Christ was coming to be expressed more and more in particular festivals in her honor. — Probably in opposition to the Collyridianians, the party of *Antidicomarianites* arose in Arabia in the 4th century, who rejected all homage of Mary, and asserted that she bore children to Joseph after the birth of Jesus. They were opposed by *Epiphanius* (Haer. 78). *Helvidius* at Rome (§ 75) held the same sentiments, and was attacked by *Jerome* (Adv. Helvidium); as did also *Bonosus* of Sardica, who found opponents in *Ambrose* of Milan, *Siricius* of Rome, and the Macedonian bishops, all of whom asserted in opposition to the Antidikomarianites the perpetual virginity of Mary.

3. The desire of many to see with their own eyes the Christian memorials in Palestine also took on a superstitious form, during this period. After *Constantine the Great*, and his mother *Helena*, had built splendid churches upon noted localities in sacred history, very many made *pilgrimages* to them, as in themselves sanctifying and meritorious undertakings. This practice went so far, in this period, that Gregory of Nyssa (Epist. ad Ambros. et Basil.), Jerome (Ep. 49 ad Paulin.), and others, could only prevail in part against it, by their earnest representations that without a sanctified heart God was no nearer in Jerusalem than in Britain.

All these doubtful forms of worship were so deeply wrought into the feeling and practice of the church in this period, that opposition to them very naturally led to separation from the church. To the class of those who contended against the germinating superstition of this period, belonged, *probably*, *Aërius*, about 350, a presbyter under Eustathius bishop of Sebaste in Armenia. Besides the worship of saints, Aërius opposed the current opinions in respect to the superiority of the bishop over the presbyter, the celebration of the Jewish passover which was still observed here and there in the East, the laws requiring fasts, and the practice of praying for the dead. His views involved him in a dispute with his bishop, and he became the founder and head of a small sect which met with severe persecution from the hierarchical church.

SECTION FOURTH.

History of Doctrine.

CHAPTER FIRST.

THEOLOGY AND CONTROVERSIES.

§ 81.

DIFFERENT THEOLOGICAL TENDENCIES.

THE same general system of Christian doctrine which had been asserted by the leading minds of the preceding period, in opposition to Judaism, Paganism, and internal Heresy, and had been in some degree scientifically developed (Comp. § 40), passed over also into this period. But the diverse tendencies which had sprung up in the first period, and which had existed side by side without conflict, or at least had not met in violent antagonism, now came into collision with each other, owing to the external peace and prosperity of the church. The result was those *Theological Controversies*[1] in which the church now engaged, — not for the purpose of originating new doctrines, but of cognizing and stating the old and standing truths of Christianity more distinctly, and grasping them more firmly. In this process, it is true, many errors were committed, owing to the mixture of human infirmity. The influence of controversy was undeniably injurious, when tendencies which ought to have been conciliated and fused with each other flew off in repulsion and became the nuclei of inimical parties; when, forgetting the limited powers of the human mind and going beyond the written word of God, the theologian sought to make too minute and detailed statements respecting invisible things; when disputants failed to distinguish between essentials and non-essentials, and lost sight of practical religion in their disputes; and when, — what was most injurious of all, — the controversy was conducted with worldly passion and ambition, instead of a pure and spiritual love of truth, and in the fear of God. But, on the other hand, inasmuch as the theoretical differences between parties were not settled in the way of unmeaning concessions and compromises, but by a thorough analysis, a clear discrimination of conceptions, and an exact use of terms, great and valuable results accrued in the more definite statement, and firmer establishment, of the doctrinal system of the church. Some of the essential truths of Christianity, which had hitherto been perceived more or less dimly and stated somewhat vaguely, now assumed a clear and sharply defined form, and the total body of Christian doctrine acquired the compact and massive character of a symbol, without which it could not have passed through the storms that followed, without falsification. The whole thinking of mankind, by means of these polemics, became profoundly and intimately penetrated by Christian ideas, and many a corrupting tendency in Christian science and Christian life, in which very often the controversy itself had its necessity and justification, was thoroughly and perhaps forever eradicated. Upon these and other grounds, the theological controversies of this period challenge the respectful regard of both the scientific and the Christian mind, in opposition to the disparaging judgments that have so frequently been passed by superficial investigators.

---

[1] Respecting all the individual controversies till into the 9th century, compare Walch Ketzerhistorie.

In these controversies, the characteristic differences between the Christian Orient and the Christian Occident (Comp. § 40) appear in a striking manner. In the former, the speculative tendency prevailed; in the latter, the practical. In the East, the controversy related to speculative theology; in the West, to practical anthropology. Even the heresies of the East were rather of a theoretical cast; and those of the West, of a more practical character.

If we take a *Survey of the Doctrinal Development of this period*, we find the following principal tendencies. The contest of the preceding period, between the practical spirit represented by Tertullian and Irenaeus, and the speculative tendency of the Alexandrine school, had not been without its beneficial influences upon this latter. Many of the Origenistic notions and opinions had by this time been decidedly rejected by the church generally, in the course of doctrinal discussion, and were now retained and defended only by a few zealous partisans. On the other hand, the scientific spirit of the Alexandrine school, purified and strengthened, had by this time spread very widely through the church, and animated some of the most distinguished theologians of the 4th century. *Eusebius Pamphili*, *Athanasius*, *Basil the Great*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, and *Gregory Nyssa* (Comp. § 86), owed their scientific culture to Origen. — Origen had exerted a great influence upon exegesis. by opposing a merely literal method which does not reach the profound significance of revealed truth, though at the same time he had fallen into a mode of allegorizing, whereby he imported into the Bible much that was heterogeneous and foreign. A powerful counteraction to this false trait in the Origenistic hermeneutics proceeded from the *School of Antioch*, from the close of the 4th century onward. Learned Antiochians, like *Dorotheus* and *Lucian* (§ 60), had already prepared the way as early as the close of the 3d century, and now in the 4th century the grammatico-historical tendency of the Antiochian School received a new impulse through *Eusebius of Emisa*. This school reached its highest point, under the influence of *Diodorus of Tarsus* and *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, whose doctrinal latitudinarianism required to be tempered and checked by *Chrysostom* and *Theodoret* in the 5th century (§ 87). — Contemporaneously with the Antiochian school, there flourished in the West a yet more important one, nay, the most important of all in the patristic period. This was the theological *School of Augustine*, — a man who was inferior indeed to Origen in respect to philological learning, but in whose mind there was a wonderful union and interpenetration of profound intuition with logical acuteness and power of systematic combination. Awakened by scattered glimpses of moral truth, Augustine, after having been long tossed about in the storms of his inward and his outward life, had sought for truth in the esoteric system of the Manichaeans. Discovering his mistake, he anchored in the haven of scepticism, until Platonism became a bridge for him to the Christianity of the church, which he now seized with the entire living force of his soul. Inasmuch as it was *faith* that had cleared up and illuminated his inner life, that which was the substance of his own personal experience became also the animating principle of his theology. He now saw that a one-sided ratiocination could never bring rest to the human mind, and that the right apprehension of divine things could proceed only from a moral change in the soul, — only from living faith and communion with God. This principle (fides praecedit intellectum) shaped and moulded the entire theological thinking of Augustine, — and particularly his powerful polemics against those, on the one hand, who would make faith to depend upon speculation, and those, on the other, who insisted upon a blind credence without any endeavor to develop Christian science from within outward.[1]

In and through the combination and interpenetration of these three great forces, — *a modified Origenism, a learned Antiochianism, and a spiritual Augustinianism*, — the doctrinal development of this period, and also its controversial history, received its type and characteristics.

---

[1] For a fuller account of Augustine, see § 91.

Arian and connected Controversies.

Athanasius Orationes contra Arianos. Epiphanius Haereses, 69, 71—76. Walch Ketzerhistorie, II. III. Baur Dreieinigkeitslehre, I. 320—490. Dorner Person Christi, I. 806—939. Meier Trinitatslehre. Ritter Geschichte der christlichen Philosophie, II. Stark Versuch einer Geschichte des Arianismus. Neander Church History, II. 361—410. Pearson On the Apostles' Creed. Bull Defensio fidei Nicaenae. Horsley Tracts. Harvey The Three Creeds.

§ 82.

VIEWS PREVALENT AT THE BEGINNING OF THIS PERIOD.

The first great controversy related to the *Doctrine of the deity of Christ and the Trinity.* This doctrine had been decidedly asserted by the greater part of the church, although it had not always been enunciated and defended with strict accuracy and self-consistence. In another and smaller portion of the church, the doctrine had become involved in subtile and confused speculations, and was thereby shorn in part of its own proper power and impressiveness for the Christian mind and heart. In this way, moreover, that shallow method was introduced, which would remove the real or supposed difficulties connected with the doctrine, by the denial of all its mystery and transcendence, and thus the nullification of its essential nature and type,—thereby rendering all endeavors after a profound construction of this cardinal and distinctively Christian truth, superfluous.

The general doctrine of the deity of Christ, and the substance of the doctrine of the Trinity, had indeed been asserted and defended in the preceding period by distinguished church teachers, in opposition to the theories and attacks of heretics (Comp. § 56); but at the same time the germs of divergent theories upon these recondite themes had been formed even among the advocates of Trinitarianism. These now appeared with so much distinctness, in the beginning of this period, that they came into collision and conflict with each other. Still, in the largest part of the church both East and West, and throughout almost the entire West, the Son of God was now acknowledged to be metaphysically different from all creatures, God in the literal and proper sense, hence equal in essence with the Father, *ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί,* begotten from eternity out of the essence of the Father; so that there was in the three persons of the Triad, who were carefully distinguished from each other, a perfect and co-equal participation in the Divine Essence, *μία οὐσία.* The doctrine of unity of essence, in combination with that of hypostatical generation, was regarded as the only solvent of the difficulty of holding to both the strict deity of Christ and the strict unity of the Godhead. This Trinitarian system appears distinctly in the writings of *Dionysius of Rome* (§ 59, 5), and germinally in those of *Irenaeus* and *Tertullian*[1] (§ 56), though in these latter not dialectically wrought out, and not altogether free from heterogeneous elements. — At length a small party, confined almost exclusively to the Oriental church, and in fact merely the party of a single presbyter of Alexandria, came forth in direct and violent opposition to the Catholic doctrine and belief. Planting itself upon the earlier expressions of *Dionysius of Alexandria*, which he afterwards retracted (See § 56 and 59, 5), and failing to grasp the distinction between generation and creation, this party asserted that the Father is the only divine being absolutely without beginning, and above the whole created universe; that by his will all other existences, including the Son and Holy Spirit, were created from nothing; and that Christ, consequently, was a *κτίσμα* having a beginning to his existence by the will of the Father, though exalted above all other creatures, in the production of whom he had been the Father's instrument, and might therefore be called God, inasmuch as he had been endowed by the Father with the divine power to create. — Midway between the church doctrine and this of *Arius*, stood a third party, at the commencement of this period, comprising an important portion of the Oriental church. Originally composed of the moderate adherents of Origenism, — a mode of thinking with which Arianism unquestionably had some affinity, but which was by no means an intrinsically shallow one, as was Arianism,[1] — this third party, for the very reason that it occupied a middle position, soon drew into itself, and became the representative of, all that class of theologians who were inclined to indefinite statements, and were afterwards known as the Semi-Arians. This party, following the general conclusions of the Alexandrine school, — of *Clement*, *Origen* (§ 56 and § 59, 5), and *Dionysius* also, — agreed with the Catholic-Occidental system, that the Son of God is different from all creatures not merely in degree but also in essence, and also in holding the idea of his eternal generation, which they emphasized, however, more than did the Western Trinitarians who had adopted it from them. On the other hand, this party differed from the Catholic-Occidental Trinitarianism in rejecting the doctrine of the generation of the Son out of the essence of the Father, *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας,* as leading in their opinion to the emanation theory, and also the doctrine of consubstantiality in the Triad, *ὁμοουσίον,* as annihilating in their judgment the personal distinctions.

---

[1] Tertullian was the first who used the term trinitas (Adv. Prax.).

It is evident that only on the Catholic-Occidental system could the *true* deity of Christ, and consequently a true and proper Trinity, be asserted with strictness and self-consistence; for neither a created God having a beginning of existence, nor a God not strictly *identical* in essence with the Father, however close the *similarity* of essence might be, could be conceived of as the essentially one and true Deity. The defects and positive errors of this middle theory, moreover, were revealed more and more, as the rigorous and remorseless logic of the great controversy extorted from it its latent inconsistencies and inherent self-contradictions.

[1] Wolff Verhältnisz des Origenianismus zum Arianismus, in the Zeitschrift für Luth. Theologie und Kirche. 1842.

§ 83.

HISTORY OF THE CONTROVERSY TO THE YEAR 325.

The Arian controversy took its start in the church at Alexandria. In opposition to the zealous defence of the Catholic-Occidental Trinitarianism by the Alexandrine bishop *Alexander*, the presbyter *Arius*, — a pupil of the Antiochian presbyter Lucian, and now connected with the basilican church in Alexandria, — came out at first somewhat privately; but distinctly and publicly after an exegetico-dogmatical conference, in 318, which the bishop of Alexandria had held with his clergy as he was wont to do from time to time. Arius positively and somewhat haughtily rejected the church doctrine of a γέννησις ἄναρχος τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός, and an ὁμοουσία of the Son with the Father, because he could not comprehend it, and supposed that the unity of the divine essence together with the distinction of persons in the Triad was endangered thereby.[1] He asserted, on the contrary, that the Son of God was a κτίσμα ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, and that ἦν πότε, ὅτε οὐκ ἦν.[2] Alexander knew the system of Arius to be corrupt and injurious in the highest degree, since, according to it, Christ however exalted in the scale of creation must yet be a creature subject to change, and consequently could neither be the true and very God, nor the true Redeemer of mankind; and hence he deposed and excommunicated him at a synod convened at Alexandria in 321. But Arius soon found influential friends; of whom the chief was bishop *Eusebius of Nicomedia*, together with the sophist *Asterius* of Cappadocia. Besides these, he was more or less befriended by many who favored the Origenistic way of thinking, — for example, by bishop *Eusebius of Caesarea*, — who believed that in a controversy of this kind the limits of both the human mind and divine revelation were being overstepped, and who desired to restore peace to the Alexandrine church by general and indefinite statements. The emperor *Constantine* likewise, influenced by Eusebius of Caesarea, recommended in a letter characterized by diffuseness and indifference, that both sides should yield something, and be mutually tolerant, in a controversy that was wholly speculative and useless (Euseb. Vit. Const. II. 64 sq.). Notwithstanding this, Alexander felt constrained in conscience to refuse toleration to Arius, and the contest increased more and more. At the same time, however, the emperor himself, — under the influence of Catholic-Occidental theologians, and particularly of *Hosius* bishop of Cordova (d. 361), — began to see that Christianity includes something more than a belief in a Divine providence,[1] and that the doctrine of Arius was incompatible with that of the deity of Christ; and with this feeling he called, in the year 325, a general council at *Nice* in Bithynia, — the *first oecumenical council*,[2] — for the settlement of the controversy. He attended the sessions himself, and exhorted the hundreds of bishops present,[3] to a calm and dispassionate investigation. Some of the bishops, and particularly *Eusebius of Caesarea*, sought to harmonize the parties by means of a formula of general character; and Eusebius laid before the council a creed drawn up in the same general phraseology which had heretofore been employed. A large number of the bishops present, who were most of them Orientals, would have been satisfied with this symbol; but Alexander, and those who agreed with him, — among whom was the young and highly gifted archdeacon *Athanasius* of Alexandria, who had accompanied his bishop, — strong already in numbers, but still more so in their energy and unity, believed that the time had now come for the church to give expression to its opposition to Arianism, in plain and unambiguous phraseology. They accordingly inserted additional clauses in the symbol of Eusebius, which the emperor adopted, and thus arose the *Symbolum Nicaenum*. After the words *γεννηϑεὶς ἐκ τοῦ πατρός*, were added: *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός* and *γεννηϑεὶς, οὐ ποιηϑείς*. It was still further defined, that the Son of God is *ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί*, and a sentence of condemnation was expressly enunciated with respect to the doctrine of Arius.[1] Eusebius at first declared

---

[1] Of Arius's writings there are extant, of his principal work the Θαλεία, *Thalia* (Athanas. De synod. Arim. et Seleuc.), only a few fragments in Fabricii Bibl. Graec. VIII. 309 seq.; his brief *Confessio ad Const.* and 2 *Epistolae* (*ad Euseb. Nicomed.* and *ad Alexandr.*, in Epiphan. Haer. 69. § 6—8) are the only entire productions of Arius that have been preserved. He sought to disseminate his doctrines in songs for seamen, millers, and travellers.

[2] Διδάσκομεν, — he said in an Ep. ad Euseb. Nicomed. (Epiphan. Haer. 69. 6), — ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγέννητος, οὐδὲ μέρος ἀγεννήτου κατ᾽ οὐδένα τρόπον, οὐδὲ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου τινός· ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι ϑελήματι καὶ βουλῇ ὑπέστη πρὸ χρόνων καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων πλήρης ϑεὸς, μονογενὴς, ἀναλλοίωτος, καὶ πρὶν γεννηϑῇ ἤτοι κτισϑῇ ἢ ὁρισϑῇ ἢ ϑεμελιωϑῇ, οὐκ ἦν· ἀγέννητος γὰρ οὐκ ἦν διωκομεϑα, ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐστίν. At the same time, Arius by no means denied that a nature higher by far than that of all other creatures, had been imparted to the Son by the will of the Father. The consubstantiality, or *identity* of essence, between Father and Son, was the chief point of attack for Arius.

---

[1] This alone, he had said in his letter above-mentioned, was the essential truth in Christianity.

[2] According to *Pagi's* chronological computation, the council sat from the 14th or 19th of June till the 25th of August.

[3] The number of bishops at Nice was upwards of 250, according to *Eusebius* Vit. Const. III. 8; *Socrates*, H. E I., makes them 300; *Eustathius* of Antioch mentions in a homily that they were about 270 in number; *Athanasius* in a letter to the African bishops, *Hilary* Contra Constantium, *Jerome* in his Chronicon, and *Rufinus* in his Church History, all state the number to be 318; yet *Athanasius*

De decretis synodi Nic., remarks that there may have been some more or some less than 300 bishops present. — The bishops came from Europe, Africa, and Asia, according to *Eusebius* III. 7; among them were a Persian, and a Scythian bishop, and, — according to *Socrates* II. 41, — a Gothic one. The greater portion were, naturally, Oriental bishops. The bishop of the metropolis, according to *Eusebius* III. 7, — without doubt *Sylvester* of Rome, — was not present on account of his age, and was represented by some presbyters. Only about 20 bishops were on the side of Arius.

[1] The Symbolum Nicaenum (See Socr. H. E. I. 8; Theodoret. H. E. I. 11) is as follows: *Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα ϑεὸν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ϑεοῦ, γεννηϑέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, ϑεὸν ἐκ ϑεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, ϑεὸν ἀληϑινὸν ἐκ ϑεοῦ ἀληϑινοῦ, γεννηϑέντα, οὐ ποιηϑέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρί· δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ· τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνϑρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελϑόντα καὶ σαρκωϑέντα καὶ ἐνανϑρωπήσαντα, παϑόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τριτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἀνελϑόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ὅτι ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηϑῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν, τρεπτὸν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ϑεοῦ, ἀναϑεματίζει ἡ καϑολικὴ ἐκκλησία.* — The original acts of the Nicene Council being lost, the principal sources are: the pastoral letters which *Eusebius* wrote to his church, Euseb. Ep. ad Caesarienses in Theodoret. H. E. I. 12; and

himself in opposition to these additions, particularly to that of the *ὁμοουσία,* but afterwards acquiesced from outward reasons, interpreting the symbol according to *his* understanding of it (Comp. § 82).[1] His influential example was followed by nearly all those Oriental bishops who, like him, did not adopt the Catholic-Occidental system. Only two Egyptian bishops, — *Theonas* of Marmorica and *Secundus* of Ptolemais, — steadily refused to subscribe the Nicene symbol, and were with *Arius* banished to Illyria (§ 69, 1). The emperor, perfecting the decisions of the general council, gave orders by edict that all the writings of Arius should be burnt; that whoever should conceal them should be put to death; and that the adherents of Arius should be regarded as the enemies of Christianity, like the followers of Porphyry. At the council, *Eusebius of Nicomedia* and *Theognis* bishop of Nice subscribed the symbol, excepting the damnatory clause; but they afterwards came openly into collision with the emperor, and were banished to Gaul.

§ 84.

HISTORY OF THE CONTROVERSY FROM 325—356.

The controversy was by no means brought to an end by the decisions of the Nicene Council; for now ensued, through the devices of the Arian party who left nothing untried whereby they might rid themselves of the Nicene symbol, a long series of ecclesiastical distractions. And the Arian machinations were not in vain; since, in the first place, the large middle party of Semi-Arians, which had merely accom-

---

the work of *Athanasius* De decretis synodi Nicaenae. Compare also Athanas. Ep. ad Africanos episcopos; Socrat. H. E. I. 8; and Euseb. Vit. Const. III. 6 sq. See Ittig Historia Conc. Nic.

[1] "He got along by a sophistical interpretation, referring the *γεννηθῆναι*, in the condemned proposition, to the *human* birth." Neander I. 376. Note 5. "The ὁμοουσιον was [for Eusebius and others] nothing more than a designation of the ὁμοιότης κατ᾽ οὐσίαν." Neander I. 377.

modated itself to the results at Nice, though by no means adopting the views of Arius, yet in its dislike of the Nicene doctrine of consubstantiality supposed, mistakenly enough, that it had ground for joining with the Arians in opposition to the church doctrine; and since, in the second place, the folly and weakness of the emperors, upon whom the church had now become too dependent, were no match for the adroitness of these stratagems.

The vacillating Constantine, surrounded by many distinguished Semi-Arian bishops like *Eusebius of Caesarea*, and greatly under the influence of his sister *Constantia*, who had an Arian presbyter for her spiritual adviser whom at her death she commended to her brother, came gradually to take another view of the controversy, not very different from his first one,—viz.: that Arius had by no means intended to deny the divine dignity of Christ, and that the whole controversy had originated merely in an idle love of disputation. The exiled bishops were recalled (328—330), and the emperor expressed himself satisfied with a confession of faith which Arius presented to him in 330 (Socrat. H. E. I. 19), in which he professed belief in the deity of Christ in general terms,[1] and ordered that he should be restored to his office as presbyter at Alexandria. Meanwhile Alexander had died in 326, and had been succeeded by his arch-deacon *Athanasius*,—a man of the same doctrinal opinions, but in intellect, force, and activity, far his superior; of singular acuteness, remarkable dogmatic talent, and striking eloquence; of invincible constancy and fidelity to his convictions, and above all fear of man; a reverent student of Origen to whose writings he owed much, and yet from a higher and more scriptural position avoiding the errors of his teacher, and justly acquiring the title of pater orthodoxiae.[2] The new bishop declared to the emperor in the most decided and serious manner, that his conscience would not permit him to allow the dissemination of anti-Christian doctrines in his diocese, and that he could not receive Arius into communion.[1] This of itself tended to set the emperor against Athanasius; but in addition to this, his enemies, in an adroit and malicious manner, now made use of everything having a contentious look, to render Athanasius an object of hatred to the emperor, as a dangerous disturber of the public peace. He was summoned to appear at *Tyre* in 335, to be tried by a synod composed almost entirely of his declared enemies. Many of the allegations brought against him he refuted completely; the remainder were assigned to a committee who were to make investigations in Egypt on the spot, and report to the synod. But the manifest injustice shown by the synod, particularly in allowing no one belonging to the party of the accused to accompany the commission, made him unwilling to await its decision. He hastened to Constantinople, and petitioned the emperor for a new examination. In the meantime the synod pronounced the decree of deposition upon him. Constantine summoned the bishops to Constantinople; only the most violent of the enemies of Athanasius made their appearance, and,—whether as a punishment or a temporary device to bring about peace in the church is uncertain,—the emperor exiled Athanasius to Triers in Gaul, in 336. About the same time, *Arius*, having already been received into church communion at Jerusalem, was to have been again solemnly received into church fellowship at Constantinople. *Alexander* bishop of Constantinople steadfastly refused to admit him, but in vain, and now betook himself to God in prayer. Before the day of consecration Arius suddenly died a terrible death.[1] *Constantine* died soon after, in 337. *Constans*, only carrying out the will of his father as he said, sent back Athanasius to Alexandria, and his church received him again with enthusiasm. But the ecclesiastical distraction was only temporarily quelled; it broke forth again with yet more intensity owing to the Arianism of the emperor *Constantius*. The enemies of Athanasius soon succeeded in prejudicing Constantius in the East against him. They now desired to make sure of the co-operation of the Western church, in the contemplated attack upon Athanasius, and for this purpose addressed themselves to the Roman bishop *Julius* (337—352). Julius demanded that both parties should plead their cause before an Occidental synod. Athanasius was ready for this, but not so his opponents. At a council held at *Antioch*, in 341, the enemies of Athanasius,—claiming that he had been regularly deposed by an ecclesiastical court, and had been only irregularly restored by an emperor,—hastily passed a new sentence of deposition upon him, and forced upon the Alexandrine church a violent Cappadocian, named *Gregorius*, as their bishop. Athanasius in the meanwhile had taken refuge in Rome, and was here recognized as orthodox. But in order, now, to prove their own orthodoxy to the Occidental church, and relieve themselves from the charge of Arianism, the Oriental bishops in session at Antioch, who were certainly most of them Semi-Arians,[1] drew up *four confessions of faith*, in 341 and 342, in which, without adopting the *ὁμοούσιος*, they approximated as closely as possible to the Nicene symbol. The fourth of these confessions was altogether like that which Eusebius of Caesarea had presented to the council at Nice,—the doctrine of Arius being condemned, without however mentioning his name. In the year 345, they drew up a *fifth* and more detailed confession, the *μακρόστιχος ἔκϑεσις*, in which the Son was denominated truly and perfectly God and like the Father in every respect. The Western church declined to go into the examination of these confessions, but took the ground that the doctrine enunciated at Nice was the only true one. Thus arose, since the East assumed an Anti-Nicene attitude, an ecclesiastical dissension between the West and East. For the removal of this, the emperor *Constantius*, through the influence of his brother *Constans*, summoned a general council. This council, which met at *Sardica* in Illyria in 347, split into two, owing to the diversity of interests between the Oriental Anti-Nicenes and the Occidental bishops. The former convened a council at *Philippopolis* in Thrace, which adopted the fourth Antiochian formula. The Western bishops, who remained in council at *Sardica*, on the contrary opposed all new and perplexing definitions, and abode strictly by the decisions of the general council at Nice. Nevertheless, through the influence of Constans upon Constantius, the conclusions of Sardica obtained credit in the East, and thus the Nicenes acquired a temporary victory. *Athanasius* again assumed his office amidst the exultations of his church. But his enemies did not give up their plans. When *Constans* lost his empire and his life through *Magnentius*, in 350, they were easily able

---

[1] "*εἰς κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν ϑεοῦ. τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων γεγεννημένον ϑεὸν λόγον, δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο κ. τ. λ.*"

[2] He was born at Alexandria about 296; compare § 64, and 85.

---

[1] Athanasius regarded Arianism as an anti-Christian scheme, because according to it Christ could not be a true and proper Mediator between God and man. For in reference to the essence of God, Christ stood in a foreign relation to it. He was of a heterogeneous nature, and hence no man could attain to *immediate* communion with God by him. Furthermore, the divine veneration accorded to Christ by Arianism could not be regarded otherwise than as the worship of a created nature or being. — The Athanasian Trinitarianism had a twofold polemic reference; partly towards the Arians, and partly towards the middle party of Origenistic Semi-Arians. The Arians stumbled particularly at the idea of a generation of the Son from the Father; for if this were different from a *κτίσις*, it must lead to sensuous anthropomorphic notions of the Deity. To this Athanasius replied that all expressions respecting God taken from temporal relationships are symbolical and consequently are misapprehended unless cleared of what is temporal and sensuous. The idea of generation implies only, that that, to which it is attributed, is *grounded in and partakes of the essence* of the Father, and is not *produced from nothing*, ab extra, by his will. It consequently designates the most direct and exact contrary to "creation from nothing." — Against the middle party, who stumbled particularly at the *ὁμοούσιον*, and preferred the idea of *resemblance* of essence, *ὁμοιότης κατ᾽ οὐσίαν*, Athanasius urged the fact that there are generically but two essences, — the Uncreated and the created, — and that every existence must participate in one or the other. In reference to the Uncreated divine essence, consequently, either identity or heterogeneity must be asserted, and there is in this connection no middle term like "resemblance." This latter conception properly applies only to finite things; and yet if applied, as the Semi-Arians would have it, to the relation between the Father and the Son, it would not discriminate the Son *in kind* from finite rational spirits; since these all have a nature *kindred* or *like* to that of Deity, but not identical or consubstantial with it. Between the position, therefore, that the Son is a creature of God produced by his will, and the position that the Son is of the same substance with the Father, there is no properly middle position.

---

[1] See Athanas. Ep. ad Serap. de morte Arii; Socrat. H. E. I. 38; Sozom. H. E. I. 29 sq.

---

[1] Only a small portion of them were actually inclined to Arianism proper, but all of them were willing to join with the Arians in opposition to the Nicene Symbol.

to prejudice *Constantius* anew against Athanasius. First, they assembled in council at *Sirmium* in Pannonia, in 351. Here they proceeded, in the first place, against *Marcellus* bishop of Ancyra in Galatia,—one of the friends of Athanasius, whose orthodoxy had with reason become questionable, and against whom the defenders of the Nicene symbol themselves afterwards declared.[1] Though a man of learning, he was lacking in dialectic skill, and his zealous polemic defence of the Nicene ὁμοούσιος led him to the use of expressions that nullified the personal distinctions in the Triad, and made of the Logos merely a divine power or energy,—an error at the other extreme from Arianism.[2] Marcellus had been deposed by the Anti-Nicene party at Constantinople in 336, and his doctrines had been assailed by Eusebius of Caesarea, at the request of this council, in his two works, *Contra Marcellum* and *De ecclesiastica theologia;* and still he had found protection, as the friend of Athanasius, in the West and at the council of Sardica. In the meantime, however, a pupil of his, *Photinus* bishop of Sirmium, had come into notice, who developed to its full extent the scheme of Marcellus, and enunciated plainly the doctrine held in the preceding period by Paul of Samosata: that the Logos was simply the divine Wisdom or Reason, either immanent in God or outworking from him;[3] and that Jesus was denominated the Son of God only in an eminent sense, as being enlightened by the divine Logos in a higher degree than all preceding prophets. This doctrine of Photinus had already been condemned by some earlier synods, — that of *Antioch* in 345, and the Western synod of *Milan* in 346, — but now the Sirmian council formally deposed *Photinus* from his office, and published definite decisions against his doctrine and that of *Marcellus*.[1]

---

[1] Fragments of his writings are extant, particularly *De subjectione Domini* (Περὶ τῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ ὑποταγῆς): Marcelliana ed. H. G. Rettberg. Respecting him, see Epiphan. Haer. 72; also Klose Geschichte und Lehre des Marcellus und Photinus.

[2] In his zeal against the Arian *Asterius*, Marcellus certainly went to the verge of Sabellianism. He laid down the position, that the relation of the Logos to the Father is fittingly represented only as an existing in the Father, and that the coming forth of the Logos is the creating activity of the Father manifesting itself. In order to avoid the Subordination-theory, Marcellus warned against a *διαίρεσις προσώπων.*—Respecting his system, compare e.g., Fragm. 54: *Πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι ἦν ὁ λόγος ἐν τῷ πατρί. Ὅτε δὲ ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεὸς πάντα ποιῆσαι προθέτο, ἐνεργείας ἡ τοῦ κόσμου γένεσις ἐδεῖτο δραστικῆς· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, μηδενὸς ὄντος ἑτέρου πλὴν θεοῦ, τότε ὁ λόγος προελθὼν ἐγένετο τοῦ κόσμου ποιητής, ὁ καὶ πρότερον ἔνδον νοητῶν ἑτοιμάζων αὐτόν.* Again Fragm. 64: *Δύναμις τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ λόγος. Ἀδυνατόν ἐστιν, ἢ λόγον θεοῦ ἢ θεὸν τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ στερίζεσθαι λόγου.*

[3] Photinus distinguished between a *λόγος συστελλόμενος* and *πλατυνόμενος*, as the Samosatenians did between a *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and *προφορικός*.

But the chief effort of the Anti-Nicene party was ever directed against *Athanasius* himself, and it was now apparent that they must, first of all, cut him off from the support of the Occidental church. They had not succeeded thus far, by the use of arguments and ecclesiastical resources. The imperial power must be brought into requisition, in order to give peace to the church; and the person of Athanasius must be sacrificed for this object. During the residence of *Constantius* in the West, after his victory over Magnentius, the party obtained an imperial order, that all the Western bishops should subscribe to the condemnation of the person of Athanasius. Many firmly resisted this device to condemn a man without a hearing, and saw that the plan was levelled not so much against the person, as against the doctrine, of Athanasius. Nevertheless the emperor, through artifice and force, brought over a large part of the Western bishops to his purposes, particularly at the synods of *Arles* in 353, and *Milan* in 355. The remainder, who refused compliance, were deposed and banished. To these latter belonged among others: *Liberius* bishop of Rome 352—366, — who nevertheless afterwards went over to the Anti-Nicenes, by yielding to imperial compulsion and subscribing probably the second Sirmian symbol, and assenting to the condemnation of Athanasius; *Hilary* bishop of Pictavium (Poitiers) 350 and after, who however returned in 360 from his exile in Phrygia to his church, — the Athanasius of the West,[2] whether regard be had to his writings, his labors, or his sufferings; and *Lucifer* bishop of Calaris (Cagliari), — a man of undaunted courage in both the confession and defence of truth, but who forgot, in his polemic zeal, the respect due to his emperor. Thus was the West compelled to a temporary silence; and now, by an armed force, a passionate and savage Cappadocian *Georgius* was once more installed bishop in Alexandria. *Athanasius* concluded divine service with calmness and dignity in his own church already surrounded by soldiers, provided for the safety of his flock, and, escaping almost by a miracle from the soldiers who were waiting for him, continued to discharge his clerical functions among the monks in the deserts of Egypt. In the year 356, the victory of the Anti-Nicenes, brought about in this violent manner, was apparently universal and complete. But it bore within itself the seeds of destruction to the Arian party.

---

[1] These antithetic positions of Sirmium and Antioch (see Athanas. De synodis cet. § 26 sq., and Socrat. H. E. II. 19) are the chief sources for the doctrine of Photinus.

[2] The most noteworthy of his writings are: *Ad Constantium* (in which he expresses himself energetically against the mingling of the ecclesiastical with the

§ 85.

HISTORY OF THE CONTROVERSY AFTER THE YEAR 356.

Arianism had now reached its culminating point, whence it began its setting. From this time onward, in spite of Arian intrigues and the cabals of court bishops, we find that system of Nicene Trinitarianism which was distinguished not only for its internal self-consistency, but also for its harmony with the Scriptures and the Christian consciousness, and which had been adopted by the greatest church teachers in this and the preceding period, gradually reacquiring its old rights and influence.

The seemingly brilliant victory of the Anti-Nicenes contributed to this result. Hitherto the Arians and Semi-Arians

---

political); *De Trinitate libb. XII.; De synodis adv. Arianos; De synodis Ariminensi et Seleucensi;* and *Commentationes* upon Psalms, and Matthew. The principal edition of his works is the Benedictine, by Constant Par 1693; re-edited by Maffeus Veron. 1730.

had been united by a common opposition to the Nicene symbol; and in this union alone were they strong. Victorious for the moment, there was less necessity for opposing the common enemy; and the internal opposition between these two parties, so far as there was any, now began to show itself externally. This process was hastened from the fact, that just at this time two Arians began to enunciate the Arian scheme with more distinctness and logical sequence than Arius himself had done; declaring that, since there is an infinite distance between the eternal Creator and all creatures, Christ, although exalted above all other creatures and to be called God because it is the Father's will, is yet as to essence entirely unlike the Father, *ἀνόμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν*. These two were: *Aëtius*, first an artisan and then for a time deacon at Antioch (who died about 370 after a restless life); and *Eunomius* of Cappadocia (died about 395), for some time bishop of Cyzicus, a man distinguished for his ratiocinative but superficial mode of thinking, and invincible zeal for his own scheme.[1] From this time, the strict Arians (to whom belonged *Acacius* bishop of Caesarea, the successor of Eusebius, who afterwards in the latter part of his life declared fo the Nicene symbol) were denominated *Anomoeans*, *Ἀνόμοιοι*; the Semi-Arians, on the contrary, who asserted a likeness of essence between the Father and the Son, were called *Homoeousians*, *Ὁμοιουσιανοί*. At the head of these latter, at this time, stood *Basil* bishop of Ancyra, and *Georgius* of Laodicea.

In order to prevent a split between the Anomoeans and Homoeousians, — which would necessarily prove very injurious to the interests of Arianism, — two cunning and managing court bishops of Arian proclivities, *Ursacius* of Singidunum and *Valens* of Mursa, attempted to unite the two parties by a symbolical statement couched in general terms, and from which, in particular, the word *οὐσία* should be entirely excluded. For this purpose they projected the council at *Sirmium*, in 357, which drew up the *Second Sirmian Symbol.* The authorship of this symbol they falsely attributed to the venerable centenarian *Hosius* now living in banishment. In it, all definite statements respecting the *οὐσία* of the Son of God are declared to be unscriptural, and too high for human apprehension, and are entirely rejected. The Semi-Arians saw through the designs of the Arians, and at the council of *Ancyra* 358, under the guidance of *Basil* of Ancyra, drew up, in opposition to the second Sirmian symbol, a synodal creed which is of high importance in reference to the Semi-Arian system.[1] *Constantius* now saw no way of settling the dispute except by calling a general council. Fearing this, — since in a general council the Nicenes and Homoeousians might easily form a coalition against themselves, — *Ursacius* and his Arian friends united with some of the leaders of the Semi-Arians, and met at *Sirmium* 359, to sketch a symbol to be presented to the general council when it should convene. In this, the *Third Sirmian*, they approximated as nearly as possible to the Semi-Arians, and in return were allowed to be silent respecting the *οὐσία.* It was determined, that the Son of God in relation to the Father is *ὅμοιος κατὰ πάντα,* "as the Scriptures teach." Not content with this, the Arians, and particularly the Arian courtiers, desiring to preclude all possibility of a union between the two parties of their opposers, prevailed upon the emperor, instead of calling one general council, to convene two councils in 359, — an Oriental one at *Seleucia* in Isauria, and an Occidental one at *Ariminum* in Italy.[2] The Arians distributed themselves between both councils, in order to outwit the Nicenes in the West, and the Semi-Arians in the East. But at Seleucia they were steadily met by the fourth Antiochian symbol, and at Ariminum by the Nicene. They were able, notwithstanding, to attain their end by artifices of another sort. The synod of Ariminum had sent deputies to the emperor, conveying the conclusions to which they had arrived, and a request that the council might be dissolved, and the members permitted to return to their churches. *Ursacius* and *Valens* contrived to delay the imperial audience, and, while the bishops were impatiently waiting all winter at Ariminum for leave of departure, the deputies were kept journeying up and down through Thrace attending the emperor's movements. Wearied by the delay, and unacquainted with the state of things in the Oriental churches, these deputies were at length induced, by Ursacius and Valens, to subscribe a symbol that was very similar to the third Sirmian, yet contained still less than this: viz., that the Son of God is like the Father (*ὅμοιος τῷ πατρὶ ὁ υἱὸς, καϑὼς κ. τ. λ.*) "as the Scriptures teach." Partly by artful representations, and partly by threats, Valens prevailed upon the bishops at Ariminum to receive the symbol which their deputies had subscribed;[1] and by representing to the deputies from the synod at Seleucia, that the Occidental bishops had at length given up the Nicene symbol, these latter also were induced to subscribe. The union was thus formally brought about on the part of the church, and *Constantius* now persecuted with the civil sword all who attempted to defend the doctrine of the *οὐσία*, as enemies to the peace of the church. But, as was natural, none of the strict adherents of any one of the contending parties were satisfied with the symbol. All such regarded those who had subscribed it as the betrayers of the truth, and the distraction rose to the highest pitch, when suddenly *Constantius* died in 361, and his own work and that of his court-bishops came to nought.

---

[1] Eunomius held, that there is no middle term between *ὁμοούσιος* and *ἑτεροούσιος* in reference to the divine essence; and that the *ὁμοούσιος* is incompatible with the *μοναρχία*, and conducts to the assumption of two eternal principles. The idea of an eternal generation, he asserted, was borrowed from Platonism, and involves an eternal creation. Respecting Eunomius's scheme, see Epiphan. Haer. 76, and particularly Eunomius's own defence of his doctrine in Basilii Opp. ed. Garn. Vol. I.; also Greg Nyss. Oratt. contra Eunom. Klose Geschichte und Lehre des Eunomius.

---

[1] See Epiphan. Haer. 73.

[2] See Athanas. *Περὶ τῶν γενομένων ἐν Ἀριμίνῳ τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ ἐν Σελευκεία τῆς Ἰσαυρίας συνόδων.*

The emperor *Julian* granted equal rights to all Christian parties, and this decided the victory for the Nicene symbol; for the party which had most of divine and of human right upon its side would gain most by this general toleration.— *Georgius* of Alexandria had perished in a popular tumult in 349. *Athanasius*, having been received again as bishop with the acclamations of his church, convened a synod at *Alexandria*, in 362, for the purpose of restoring church order; to which he also invited several exiled bishops who were then in this city. A dispute which had arisen among the Catholics, in the time of the great distractions, respecting the meaning of the word *ὑπόστασις,* was wisely waived by the synod; and those bishops, who, without going over to Arianism, had yet from ignorance or fear received the last symbol set forth by the Arians, were in a spirit of mildness acknowledged as members of the Catholic church and permitted to retain their offices, upon acknowledging the error.[1] *Lucifer* bishop of Calaris alone opposed this judicious decision, and afterwards formed a small party of *Luciferians* who regarded themselves alone as the true church.[2] Athanasius and the synod endeavored also, but not with equal success, to settle the important *Meletian schism at Antioch*, which arose in the following manner. The Arians in 331 had deposed *Eustathius* bishop of Antioch, a learned and zealous Nicene;[3] but a party who adhered to the Nicene symbol, and who called themselves *Eustathians*, continued to exist at Antioch. After appointing several successors to Eustathius, the Arians in 360 transferred *Meletius* from the bishopric of Sebaste to that of Antioch. Although the Arians found they had made a mistake, and soon deposed him as an enemy of Arianism, yet only a part of the Nicenes at Antioch would acknowledge him as bishop, since the Eustathians regarded an Arian ordination as invalid. In this way two parties were formed among the Nicenes at Antioch: a strict party, the *Eustathians;* and a moderate party, the *Meletians.* This schism, after Athanasius had tried in vain to remove it, *Lucifer* made worse, by ordaining as bishop over the Eustathians the presbyter *Paulinus,*—in opposition to the wishes of *Eusebius of Vercelli,* who had been sent with him to Antioch, by the Alexandrine synod, as his co-deputy. The entire Nicene portion of Christendom now became divided, in reference to this matter, into two parties; the Occidentals and Egyptians recognizing *Paulinus* as the true bishop of Antioch, and the majority of the Orientals, whose Nicene proclivities had been somewhat weakened by Semi-Arian influences, recognizing *Meletius.*— Athanasius had hardly re-commenced his labors at Alexandria, when *Julian* sent him again into exile as a disturber of the public peace,—charging him with having baptized a noble pagan, who had divulged the fact to himself. Under *Jovian* he was allowed to return to Alexandria, in 363. Jovian († 364) and his successor in the West *Valentinian I.* († 375), together with *Gratian* and *Valentinian II.,* though all of them inclined to the Nicene doctrine yet granted general toleration; but *Valens,* the brother of Valentinian I., to whom the latter had intrusted the government of the East in 364, was a zealous Arian, and was restrained in his cruel and savage treatment of the opposers of Arianism, only by the circumstances of the time, and the firmness of orthodox bishops. *Athanasius* escaped being sent into exile again, only by taking flight, in 367. After being concealed for four months, he was called forth again from his retreat, in order to pacify the clamors of his church, and permitted to spend the last years of his life in peace. He died in 373, after holding the office of bishop for forty-six years, twenty of which were spent either in flight or exile (Comp. § 84).[1]

---

[1] As this symbol had been composed at Nice in Thrace, the Ursacians often with a cunning ambiguity denominated it the Nicene symbol.

---

[1] It was required of them, *ἀναθεματίζειν μὲν Ἀρειανὴν αἵρεσιν, ὁμολογεῖν δὲ τὴν παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ὁμολογηθεῖσαν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν, ἀναθεματίζειν δὲ καὶ τοὺς λέγοντας κτίσμα εἶναι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ διῃρημένον ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ.* Ep. synod. ad Antiochenos, § 3.

[2] Comp his writings *De non parcendo in Deum delinquentibus*, and *De non conveniendo cum haereticis.*

[3] In his place, they called a man of brilliant eloquence, bishop *Eusebius of Emesa*, a pupil of Eusebius of Caesarea and friend of Eusebius of Nicomedia (§ 81); but from love of peace he declined the call. Comp. Thilo Ueber die Schriften des Eusebius von Alexandrien und des Eusebius von Emesa; Opera Eusebii Emes. ed. Augusti.

---

[1] Though hindered, by the untoward circumstances of his public life, from composing voluminous works, *Athanasius* nevertheless left behind him many *Writings,* which were called out by the wants of the church, and which though brief are of the highest value. The most important of them are controversial,—defensive of

As in the previous instance, the temporary triumph of Arianism had contributed directly to the ultimate success of the Nicene doctrine, so now the constant distractions of the Oriental church, caused by the Arian emperor *Valens*, tended to the same result; since they led the Semi-Arians to separate themselves more and more strictly from the Arians, and to join more heartily with the defenders of the Nicene symbol, against their common enemy. At the same time the united and zealous co-operation of three distinguished church teach-

---

Christianity generally, of the Nicene doctrine in particular, or of himself. They consist of treatises, discourses or letters, and historico-practical sketches in behalf of monachism (§ 74). The following are the most worthy of notice: his four discourses (Λόγοι) against the Arians, in which he defends the Nicene Trinitarianism with triumphant logic and dialectic acumen; his sketch of the history of Arianism (*Historia Arianorum ad monachos*, Ἐπιστολὴ τοῖς τὸν μονήρη βίον ἀσκοῦσιν), and a tract *De decretis synodi Nicaenae*, in answer to the objection that all precise statements respecting the *οὐσία* were unscriptural; his *Apologia ad Constantium*, and *Apologia contra Arianos de fuga sua*; his tract *De synodis Arim. et Seleuc.*, written to show his opposers' fickleness and love of novelty; his four letters to Serapion bishop of Thmuis in defence of the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit; and his treatise in two books *Contra Apollinarium* (Περὶ τῆς σαρκώσεως Ἰ. Χρ.). Some expositions of scripture by Athanasius have come down, but not all of them are certainly authentic. The loss of his Easter-programme is much to be regretted. The principal edition of his works is that of Montfaucon. Par. 1789–98. 3 vols. fol.; re-edited by Giustiniani. Patav. 1777. 4 vols. fol.

The so-called *Athanasian Creed* (Comp. Montfaucon, Diatribe, in Athanas. Opp. II.; Guericke Symbolik, pp. 68, 84, sq.) enunciates, in Athanasius's vein and manner, the pure doctrine of the Trinity, and also of the Person of Christ, in sharp precise statements, and for this reason acquired high authority in the ancient church, particularly the Occidental, and continues to maintain its place in modern symbolism. Against the Athanasian authorship of it, are urged: the silence of Athanasius's contemporaries and writers immediately succeeding; its non-appearance in the best manuscripts of Athanasius's works; the omission of the term *ὁμοούσιος*; the apparent reference to later controversies; the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father *and the Son;* and the probable Latin origin of the symbol. It has been conjectured that it originated in the school of Augustine; perhaps was composed by *Vigilius* bishop of Tapsus (the author of a work *De Trinitate*, and of three dialogues *Adv. Arium, Sabellium, et Photinum*) in the 2d half of the 5th century. For the Athanasian authorship of it, it is urged, that Athanasius lived at the very time when the heresies dialectically rejected in this symbol were most flourishing, and that passages very similar to parts of the symbol are to be found in his writings. Respecting Athanasius himself: see the biography in Montfaucon's edition of his works; Tillemont Mem. T. VIII.; Möhler Athanasius; Böhringer Die Kirche in Biographieen, Th. I. Abth. 2.

ers of Cappadocia, who may be regarded as representatives of the Christian thinking and practice of that time, contributed greatly to the spread of the Nicene faith. These were the three bishops: *Basil the Great*[1] (born about 329), first an anchorite after completing his studies at Constantinople, Antioch and Athens, then deacon, presbyter, bishop's assistant, and, after 370, bishop of Neo-Caesarea, a man as zealous for theological science as for monachism, and still greater in the management of ecclesiastical affairs, who died in 379; his brother, the profoundly scientific *Gregory*, after 372 bishop of *Nyssa* in Cappadocia, who died between 394 and 403;[2] and *Gregory Nazianzen*,[3] born about 330, the son of an excellent mother Nonna, the youthful friend of Basil, from inclination as well as by divine providence alternating between the stillness of a contemplative life and the anxieties and tumults of a public one without finding entire satisfaction in either, spending the last years of his life in strict ascetic seclusion, dying in 389 or 390, and carrying down to posterity the reputation of one of the first orators in the Greek church, and the title of ὁ ϑεολόγος. These three had all been educated by the study of classical antiquity, and of Origen's writings, and were distinguished for their scientific spirit and zeal for the orthodox faith, as well as for their practical religious spirit and diligence in Christian action. *Gregory Nazianzen* exerted more influence than the others, upon the course of events. Consecrated in 371 bishop of Sasima, and afterwards his father's assistant in the episcopal office of Nazianzen, he became the leader in 378, after the death of Valens and in accordance with the request of a synod at *Antioch*, of the orthodox party at Constantinople, who were suffering under the extreme oppression of the Arians. Preaching in a little chapel, which was afterwards converted into the splendid church *Anastatia* in commemoration of the resurrection of the pure doctrine there, Gregory labored in word and deed for the maintenance and diffusion of the Nicene faith, and the suppression of that frivolous mode which prevailed of treating the truths involved in the great controversy, as well as for the spread of a living practical Christianity, until in the year 380, after the power of the Arians had been broken everywhere else, the last great bulwark of Arianism in the Roman empire fell. In this year, the new emperor *Theodosius the Great*, a confessor of the Nicene faith, made his triumphal entry into Constantinople. The Arian bishop *Demophilus* vacated the cathedral church, and *Gregory* took possession. The Arians, refusing to subscribe the Nicene symbol, were compelled to give up all their churches, and obliged to hold their religious assemblies outside of the walls of Constantinople, — which they continued to do until the 6th century. In the year 381, the emperor convened a new general council (of 150 bishops) at *Constantinople*, the *second oecumenical council*, for the purpose of setting the seal of confirmation upon the Nicene doctrine, of removing the remaining distractions within the church, and of solemnly installing Gregory as patriarch.

---

[1] He is known by his homilies (upon the history of the creation in Genesis, Psalms, Isaiah) and other discourses, his work Περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, his work against Eunomius, his valuable collection of 428 letters, and several ascetic writings. The principal editions of his works are: that of Ducaeus. Par. 1618. 2 vols. fol.; and that of Garnier. Par. 1721. 3 vols. fol. Biogiaphies of Basil: Feisser De vita Basilii Magni; Klose Basilius der Gr.; Böhringer Kirchengeschichte in Biographieen.

[2] He is known by many practical writings, — homilies, particularly those upon the history of the Creation Περὶ τῆς ἑξαημέρου, and ascetic tracts; by dogmatical works, — particularly those against Eunomius and Apollinaris (§ 87), and a manual of theology, Λόγος κατηχετικὸς ὁ μέγας. The principal edition is that of Morellius. Par. 1615. 2 vofs.. fol. Comp Rupp Gregor's von Nyssa; Böhringer Kirchengeschichte in Biographieen.

[3] From him we have sermons and orations, particularly the five Λόγοι ϑεολογικοί in defence of the doctrine of Christ's deity; also-defences of his official conduct; an important series of 245 letters; and poems. The principal edition is that of Morellius. Par. 1630. 2 vols. fol. Comp. Ullmann Gregorius von Nazianz.; Böhringer Kirchengeschichte in Biographieen.

Gregory was in the first place consecrated patriarch of Constantinople, by *Meletius* of Antioch, the oldest of the Oriental bishops. After the death of Meletius, which occurred soon after, Gregory in conjunction with the council addressed himself to the settlement of the *Meletian schism* still existing at Antioch. Paulinus, the bishop of the Eustathian party, was now very old, and had the Meletian party, as Gregory wished, been willing to delay the appointment of a new bishop until after his death, it would have been less difficult to unite the two divisions. But a portion of the bishops threw insuperable obstacles in the way of Gregory's wise design. This vexed him; and when afterwards Occidental bishops, who were opposed to Meletius, came into the council and urged many objections to the validity of his own ordination as patriarch, he resigned his office and took leave of the council in a noteworthy discourse (Gregor. Naz. Orat. 42).[1]

Gregory of Nyssa now took the lead in the dogmatic discussions and conclusions of the council. The new confession of faith was with some few modifications a repetition of the Nicene symbol;[2] one important clause in respect to the Holy Spirit being added. — In opposition to the Arian doctrine, that the Holy Spirit is the first of created existences produced by the Father through the Son;[3] and in opposition to the Semi-Arian view, which opposed the application of the term *ὁμοούσιος* to the Holy Spirit as decidedly as it did to the Son, — the Nicene theologians, (particularly *Athanasius* in his letter to Serapion), had already insisted, that it is a contradiction to admit into the Triad anything that is of a foreign essence, that the source of all sanctification cannot be of the same created nature with those who are sanctified, and that communion with God could not be obtained in and by the Holy Spirit unless he is God himself.[4] Furthermore, a party of Semi-Arians, (named *Macedonians*[5] after Macedonius, a Semi-Arian bishop of Alexandria who was deposed by the

---

[1] He retired to Nazianzen and discharged episcopal functions at the pressing entreaty of the church there, until his relative Eulalius was appointed its bishop, in 383. He spent the remainder of his life in silent study and contemplation. — The *Meletian* schism continued to exist at Antioch till the beginning of the 5th century, when *Flavianus*, originally a Meletian, was acknowledged as bishop by both parties.

[2] The Son, it was stated, is *ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρί*; the clause *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός* (§ 83) was not added, because this phrase, now so liable to be misapprehended, was not needed.

[3] This was also the view of Eunomius, Apol. c. 25.

[4] Hilary, De Trinitate II. 29, distinctly denies that the Holy Spirit is a creature, because the Holy Spirit searches and comprehends the depths of the Godhead.

[5] Respecting them, see Epiphanius Haer. 74.

Arians in 360, and also called by Athanasius *Πνευματομάχοι*), who were ready to adopt the Nicene doctrine respecting the Son, but refused to apply the term *ὁμοούσιον* to the Holy Spirit, had already been condemned by the council of *Alexandria* 362, and by an *Illyrian* council in 375. In opposition, also, to this party in particular, *Didymus* of Alexandria (comp. § 59, 1), one of the boldest defenders of the Nicene faith, and a teacher in the Alexandrine School from 340 to 395 (?), had maintained the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit, in his work *De Spiritu Sancto*, and in the second book of his treatise *De Trinitate*.[1] And now, in addition, the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan symbol expressly asserted, in opposition to the Macedonian doctrine, that the same worship that is due to the Father and Son is due likewise to the Holy Spirit (*τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον*).[2] Thus, through the decisions of the second oecumenical council, the Nicene doctrine was completely victorious, — a doctrine which from the first had been doubted only in a portion of the East.[3]

In the *West*, there was only a single vehement and influential opponent of the Nicene symbol,—and he was not a decided Arian, but inclined to Semi-Arianism. This was bishop *Aurentius* of Milan († 374), who found a zealous opponent in *Philastrius*, afterwards bishop of Brixia († 390). The successor of Aurentius was *Ambrose* († 397),—a man of noble Roman descent, and who as Consular over Liguria and Aemilia had become highly esteemed at Milan, where he resided. The disorder which attended the election of a new bishop had caused him to appear in the church for the purpose of quieting the people, when suddenly a voice, as if of a child, shouting the name of *Ambrose*, led to his election as bishop by acclamation, though he was still only a catechumen. In his episcopal office, he was distinguished by the diligent discharge of all his duties, as well as by great activity and energy in all his public ecclesiastical relations (Comp. §§ 69, 75, 77). A notable instance of his invincible firmness occurred, when the empress *Justina* took advantage of the minority of her son *Valentinian II.* to attempt the introduction of Arianism into his diocese. He declared openly that the decision of points of doctrine did not belong to the emperor; and when the imperial court demanded of him, that he should give the Arians the use of the church edifices, on the ground that the emperor was lord of the church buildings as well as of the land upon which they stood, he replied that he could not with a clear conscience even indirectly favor the Arian worship, and should not deliver up what God had intrusted to his care. Notwithstanding all the imperial threatenings, he remained true to his convictions. With his flock, singing the hymns and psalms of the church service, but not raising a hand for resistance, he remained in his church, though it was surrounded by the government troops, until episcopal fidelity wearied out imperial infidelity.[1]

---

[1] Didymus Caecus (blind from early youth), a zealous advocate of the Nicene doctrine was also a great admirer of Origen, — though rejecting the tenet of restoration and other Origenistic opinions. Of his numerous dogmatic and exegetical writings, the following have been preserved: *Ennarrationes in epistolas VII. canonicas; De Spiritu Sancto* (Latin version among the works of Jerome); *Adv. Manichaeos; De Trinitate, libb. III.* (maintaining, in the first book, the deity of the Son upon dogmatical and exegetical grounds; in the 2d, that of the Holy Spirit; and in the 3d, defending the Nicene doctrine upon exegetical grounds, without any of the Alexandrine allegorizing). His commentaries upon most of the Bible, and upon Orig. De Principp., together with his work upon Doctrines and against the Arians, are lost. — See Guericke De schola Alex. P. I. p. 92 sq; P. II. p. 29, 83, 332, 443.

[2] The Spirit was also designated in this symbol as: *τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον*, — a clause of much importance in the future history of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. Comp. § 120.

[3] At the council of Constantinople, bishop *Cyril of Jerusalem* († 386) was present, and received with respect, — a man who had once been inclined to Semi-Arianism, but had afterwards adopted the Nicene doctrine. He had been deposed by his Arian metropolitan, Acacius of Caesarea, and also sent into exile by the emperor Valens. Of his writings, there are extant: *XVIII. Catecheses φωτιζομένων* (*ad Competentes.* — comp. § 79); *V. Catecheses mystagogicae* (to the newly baptized). Edidit Mills. Oxford 1703, and Toutteé. Paris 1720.

---

[1] Of the numerous writings of Ambrose, the most important are his dogmatic works in defence of the deity of Christ and of the Holy Spirit: viz. *De fide libb. V.*, *De Spiritu Sancto libb. III.*, *De incarnationis dominicae sacramento* (against Arians and Apollinarians). Besides these the following are important: viz. *De mysteriis s. de initiandis* (upon the sacraments); *De fide resurrectionis; De officiis libb III.* (upon the duties of church servants and teachers); *Epistolae XCIII.* (§ 64, 2). Ambrose composed sermons and practical expositions of the Scriptures,—e. g.

After the year 381, the Arians maintained their existence as a separate and oppressed party, in the Roman empire, for only about a half century. Arianism, however, continued to exist a longer time, among many savage populations who had received Christianity from Arian missionaries: among the *Vandals*, (after 429, and particularly in 430, the cruel and bloody persecutors of the Orthodox in North Africa),[1] until the destruction of their kingdom in 534 in the reign of Justinian; among the *East Goths* in Upper Italy, until the end of their rule in 533; among the *West Goths* (§ 68, 1) till 589; and among the *Lombards* (§ 103), until the middle of the 7th century. But within cultivated Christendom, Arianism had been overcome at the council of Constantinople. The pure doctrine respecting the Son of God, and the Trinity, after long and severe conflicts within and without the church, had now run through the stadia of its scientific development, and reached the goal of essential completeness.[2]

Hexaëmeron libb. VI., *Expositio ev. sec. Lucam libb. X.*, — in which latter, the influence of Grecian models, particularly Philo and Origen, upon the Latin literature is apparent. The important Commentary upon the thirteen Epistles of Paul, which goes under the name of *Ambrosiaster*, is not the work of Ambrose, but probably of *Hilary of Rome*. Ambrose has left 12 Hymns (§ 76); and the sublime anthem *Te Deum laudamus* is ascribed to him (Tentzel De hymno Te Deum cet.) The principal edition of his works is the Benedictine. Par. 1686–90. 2 vols. fol. Later editions are: Caillau and Guillon Collectio sel. eccl. patrum (Par. 1829–. 148 vols.) T. LIV.—LXII.; Gersdorf Bibl. patr. eccl. Lat. sel. Vol. VIII. IX. For the biography of Ambrose see: the memoir by his friend and contemporary Paulinus; Hermant Vie de St. Ambrose; Böhringer Kirchengeschichte in Biographieen.

---

[1] See the account of this persecution by Vita, a contemporaneous bishop of Numidia: Victor Vitensis Historia persecutionis Africanae sub Genserico et Hunnerico Vandalorum regibus (from 487). Ruinarti Historia persecutionis Vandalicae. Comp. § 91.

[2] Though at a distance from the place of conflict, another distinguished theologian also set his seal to the anathema of the oecumenical church at Nice: *Ephraem Syrus* († 378), deacon of Edessa (Osrhoë). — the teacher of the Syrian Church by making it acquainted with Grecian culture. He lived in the time of the Arian controversy, though outside of the great circle of theologians who have come prominently into view; not sharing in their contest, though coming out in opposition to the Eunomians. Of his writings there are extant: homilies, ascetic writings, hymns, and commentaries upon the Old Testament, and the Pauline Epistles. Opera Graec. et Syr. ed Assemanus. Rom. 1732–46. 6 vols. fol. Commentarii Ephraemi Syri in epp. Pauli. ed. Aucher. Venet. 1833.

§ 86

THE ORIGENISTIC AND CONNECTED CONTROVERSIES.

The Arian controversy had had reference to single, but highly important, points of doctrine; it was followed by the *Origenistic Controversy*, which related to two, and perhaps three, great tendencies in the church.

Many of the most distinguished churchmen of the 4th century (§ 81), as *Athanasius*, *Eusebius of Caesarea*, *Basil the Great*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Gregory Nyssa*, and others, without adopting the Origenistic system,[1] yet owed their theological culture to the study of the writings of Origen. These constituted a class by themselves. Almost all others were divided into two classes: the one, composed of enthusiastic admirers of Origen himself and all his doctrines; the other, of vehement opponents of this first class and of the spiritual tendency generally. The monks in Egypt, in particular, were thus divided. By one portion of them, who were inclined to certain anthropomorphic views of God and divine things, after the example of some of the earlier fathers, especially *Tertullian*,[2] Origen was abhorred. By another portion, namely, the Nitrian monks, who were zealous friends of a spiritual mysticism and enemies of all anthropomorphism, Origen was revered above all other church teachers. From the school of the first class sprang the Palestinian *Epiphanius* († 403), bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, a pious and orthodox man, but with all his learning somewhat narrow-minded, and a very violent polemic.[1] To the second class, though at first a moderate and intelligent admirer, belonged the presbyter *Jerome*, born at *Stridon* on the borders of Dalmatia and Pannomia, in 331 or 332. He early received a Christian and scientific education at Rome, though he was not baptized till about 360. The next succeeding period in his life was spent partly in travelling through Gaul, Italy, and the East, for the sake of intercourse with distinguished friends and teachers, and partly in an eremite life in Syria. Between the years 382 and 385, he led the life of a student and a monk at Rome; and from the year 386 till his death, which occurred in 419 or 420, he was the head of a society of monks at Bethlehem.[2] Jerome was the most distinguished exegete of the time, and the most learned of the then living Western theologians, — a man to whom Biblical learning owes very much,[3] but would owe more had the profound spirit of an Augustine been united with his extensive philological and historical knowledge, and had not the penetration of his mental eye been somewhat dulled by his ascetic tendency, and his austere and violent spirit. Though he made much use of Origen's researches in his own exegetical labors, and translated many of his homilies, Jerome was not an extravagant admirer of Origen, and was far from adopting the entire Origenistic system. His own destitution of a systematic spirit, and lack of interest in speculative thinking, may have contributed, with other causes, to this result. But Jerome's friend, the presbyter *Rufinus* of Aquileia († 410),[1] was an ardent student and admirer of the great Alexandrine theologian; having been for some time an attendant upon the lectures of Didymus. From the year 378 and onward, he lived the life of an ascetic on Mt. Olivet near Jerusalem, in intimate intercourse with John bishop of Jerusalem, an equally ardent admirer of Origen. Both of them also stood in confidential relations with their neighbor Jerome. But these were afterwards disturbed by some Occidentals who had come to Palestine, and who, by their vehement attacks upon the orthodoxy of Origen, made Jerome anxious about his own orthodoxy in the West. In the year 394, Epiphanius, at the invitation of these Occidentals, came to Jerusalem and demanded the condemnation of Origen. At the same time he broke with John, and ordained the brother of Jerome as presbyter over the Bethlehemite monks, warning them against connection with the church at Jerusalem. Jerome himself now sacrificed his teacher Origen to his own reputation for orthodoxy. Thus, there arose a dispute, between *John* and *Rufinus* on the one side, and *Jerome* and *Epiphanius* on the other, which was with great difficulty formally but not really settled in 397, by the efforts of *Theophilus* bishop of Alexandria. On his return to the West, while at Rome and afterwards as presbyter at Aquileia, Rufinus undesignedly gave occasion this very year 397 for a new outbreak of the differences between the parties. In order to promote the reputation of Origen in the Latin church, he translated into Latin, without sufficient reason for the procedure, the suspected and dangerous work of Origen *Περὶ ἀρχῶν*. At the same time, in order to save the orthodoxy of the work, he threw out many of Origen's erroneous speculations, claiming that they were an addition by some heretic of later date; but still left many offensive passages standing, as if he himself approved of them, and for all that he had done, justified himself by the example of a certain other admirer of Origen. The friends of Jerome could not mistake the allusion, and now demanded of him that he should free himself from this charge of participating in the Origenistic heresies. Jerome, after expressing himself in moderate terms respecting Origen, issued a literal translation of the work of Origen, in proof of Rufinus's unfaithfulness to the original. This was followed by a series of controversial writings, between him and Rufinus, in which both of them indulged in great violence of expression.[1] *Anastasius*, bishop of Rome 398—402, also cited Rufinus before his tribunal, at the same time condemning Origenism. Yet *this* controversy respecting Origen produced no important or generally extended results.

---

[1] *Gregory Nyssa* was certainly a zealous advocate of the doctrine of apocatastasis, to which even *Gregory Nazianzen* gave assent. *Eusebius*, who however had not the reputation of pure orthodoxy, stood very close to Origen in regard to some other points.

[2] Tertullian (De carne Christi c. 11) teaches: Omne quod est habeat necesse est aliquid, per quod est. Si aliquid, per quod est. hoc erit corpus ejus . . .; nihil est incorporale, nisi quod non est. Again (Adv. Praxeam c. 7): Quis enim negavit Deum corpus esse, etsi Deus spiritus est?

---

[1] His principal work is his Πανάριον, — a magazine of weapons against all (80) heresies. It concludes with a sketch of the Catholic faith. Besides this, there is extant a treatise Περὶ μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν, *De mensuris et ponderibus*, — of much value in respect to biblical studies. Opera ed. Petavius. Paris 1662.

[2] For the biographic details see: Hieronymi Epistolae; Tillemont T. XII.; Acta Sanctorum mens. Sept. T. VIII.; Engelstoft Hieronymus etc.; Lauchert and Knoll Hieronymus; Neander I. 681, seq.

[3] Jerome, at the suggestion of Damasus bishop of Rome, about 383 made a revision of the old Latin translation of the Bible, the *Itala*, the best of the early versions (Comp. Aug. De doctr. Christ. II. 11, 15), which originally was not free from errors, and had become very much corrupted. The revision of the Old Testament was made according to the Hexaplar text of Origen, and that of the New after the original Greek. Jerome also, between 385 and 405, made a new Latin translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew text. This latter version of the Old Testament, together with the revised Italic version of the New, has been the received and authentic *Vulgate* for the Romish church; having been approved first by Gregory the Great, and afterwards by the council of Trent. Of the other works of Jerome, there are extant: *Commentaries* upon a great portion of the Old Testament, particularly the prophets, upon Matthew, and the Epistles to Galatians, Ephesians, Titus, and Philemon; an *Interpretatio nominum Hebraicorum;* polemic writings (*Adv. Pelagianos*, *Luciferianos*, *Helvidium*, *Vigilantium*, *Jovinianum*, cet.); some *Memoirs* of renowned monks; the *Catalogus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum* (Lib. de viris illustribus, from 392, — sketches of ecclesiastical writers to the time of Jerome himself); and a collection of *Letters*. Opera ed. Benedictini Paris 1693 sqq. 5 vols. fol.; and Vallarsi Veron. 1734 sqq. 11 vols. fol.

---

[1] Besides Rufinus's *Translations* from the Greek, and some *Commentaries* upon the Old Testament, there are extant his *Expositio symboli apostolici* and his *Historia ecclesiastica libri II.* — Opp. ed. Vallarsi, Rome 1745.

Of more importance was that other Origenistic controversy which, taking start from another side, at length flowed into the former and mingled with it. The Anthropomorphite and Origenistic-mystical monks in Egypt were quarrelling with each other. The patriarch *Theophilus* of Alexandria (385—412), an ambitious and contentious man, had always been inclined to the latter, and, in the libellus paschalis (§ 78) for 399, had so openly attacked the anthropomorphite views, that he was able only with great difficulty and by equivocation to pacify the excited troops of Anthropomorphites who were pouring into Alexandria. This circumstance, together with the fear which it awakened, began to effect a change in his sentiments; which was hastened all the more by the personal hatred which he now came to cherish towards certain of the Origenists. At the head of these stood four brothers, the so-called *tall brethren*, *ἀδελφοὶ μακροί*, *Dioscurus*, *Ammonius*, *Eusebius*, and *Euthymius*, pious mystics, the two last of whom Theophilus had made stewards (*οἰκονόμοι*) in his own church, and the first he had made bishop of Hermopolis. But the worldly temper of Theophilus soon drove the first two back to their solitude in disgust, whither the wrath of the patriarch followed them. This wrath, an Alexandrine presbyter *Isidore*, a friend of the Origenists, had also drawn upon himself; and, in order to escape the malicious accusations of his bishop, had taken refuge with the Nitrian monks. The deputation which these sent to Theophilus, to intercede for Isidore, only embittered him the more, and he now united with Epiphanius and Jerome for the condemnation of Origenism. Alexandrine synods in 399 and 400 condemned Origen's doctrines and writings, and those Origenistic monks who refused to abide by the decision of the synods were banished. Repulsed in every place, since Theophilus sent his letters-missive everywhere, they finally betook themselves in 401 to Constantinople, hoping to obtain the protection of bishop *Chrysostom*. From this time onward, the opposition of Theophilus to the Origenists degenerated into a mere contest with Chrysostom, of whose patriarchal authority he as bishop of Alexandria had been jealous from the beginning (§ 88).

---

[1] The most important writings upon both sides were: Hieronymi *Ad Pammachium et Oceanum de erroribus Orig.*; Rufini *Apologia libb. II.*; Hieron. *Apol. adv. Ruf. libb. II*; and (in reply to Rufinus's answer which is not extant) Hieron *Responsio s. Apologia libb. III.*

John, surnamed *Chrysostom* by an admiring world, was born about 347 at Antioch. He received a Christian education from his excellent mother Anthusa (§ 73), and was very early inducted into classical studies as taught by the Antiochian school (§ 87), — the shallow clearness of which school, he supplemented by the vividness and eloquence of his own Christian feeling, and a faithful study of the Scriptures. After living six years with the monks at Antioch, during which time his Christian experience was deepened and strengthened, he was ordained a deacon in that city in 381, and a presbyter in 386. Having performed the labors of a presbyter at Antioch for nearly twelve years, with great energy and much success, he was called to the patriarchate of Constantinople in 397, through the influence of *Eutropius*.[1] His bold, and sometimes almost reckless zeal for Christian truth, and his straight-forward honesty, soon drew upon him the hatred of worldly-minded clergymen and monks. Eutropius also was soon offended by the fidelity and truthfulness of his spiritual adviser; and, after the fall of this imperial favorite, the resentment of the empress *Eudoxia* herself was awakened by the earnest rebukes of Chrysostom, for her course of conduct. Just at this moment the Origenistic monks made their appearance. Chrysostom received them, but without declaring in their favor, and endeavored to effect a reconciliation between the parties. Theophilus refused altogether, forbade Chrysostom's interfering with the concerns of another diocese, and sent deputies to Constantinople with accusations against the monks. These latter, on the other hand, presented to Eudoxia grave charges against Theophilus, and asked that the decision of the question might be assigned to Chrysostom. The vacillating empress, happening just at that time to be upon good terms with the patriarch, consented, and Theophilus was summoned to Constantinople for trial. The exasperated Alexandrine bishop now made use of every artifice, — aided by the whole body of those who were dissatisfied with Chrysostom's strictness, — to be able to appear at Constantinople not as the accused party but as the judge. As a

[1] Chrysostom's *Homilies*, especially upon John, Matthew, Acts, and the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Hebrews, prove him to have been as able an exegete as he was preacher. Besides these, there are extant: many other sermons and discourses of Chrysostom, — particularly the 21 Homilies delivered at Antioch in 387, after a riot in which the imperial images had been thrown down; also the fragment of a *Compendium of the Scriptures* (*Σύνοψις τῆς παλ. καὶ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης*); many *Ascetical Writings* (namely, libb. II. Περὶ *κατανύξεως*, upon penance libb. III. Πρὸς *τούς πολεμοῦντας τοῖς τὸ μονάζειν ἐναγοῦσιν*, in defence of monachism; *libb. III. Ad Stagirium*, a consolatory tract upon providence written for an afflicted friend); *Letters;* and his early but very excellent work Περὶ *ἱερωσύνης*, *De sacerdotio*, — upon the Christian priesthood, its duties, dignity and difficulties. — Opera ed. Savilius. Eton. 1612. 8 vols. fol. (Greek alone); Ducaeus and Morell. Paris. 1609 sqq. 12 vols. fol (Greek and Latin); Montfaucon (Benedictine ed.). Paris. 1718 sqq. 13 vols. fol. For the biography of Chrysostom, see his own Sermons and Letters; Palladius († 420) Dialogus de vita et conversatione J. Chrysost.; Socratis H. E. VI.; Sozomen. H. E. VIII.; Theodoret. H. E. V. 27 sqq.; Neander Der heilige Joh. Chrysostomus; translated by Stapleton.

preliminary, he persuaded the venerable Epiphanius to come to Constantinople in 402, to attend a synod convened at his own suggestion with reference to the Origenistic controversies, — Epiphanius having already, in the year 401, held a council at Theophilus's earnest suit for the condemnation of Origen. Epiphanius appeared, and quickly broke with Chrysostom, although the latter showed him sincere respect; but soon becoming suspicious of the motives that were operating in the mind of the party he was serving, he left the synod hastily in displeasure. Meanwhile the enemies of Chrysostom had sowed the seeds of a new disagreement between him and Eudoxia, — whose conscience led her to regard every word of rebuke uttered by the bishop in his sermons as intended for herself, — and she now sided with Theophilus. The latter, in 403, came to Chalcedon opposite Constantinople, and, for the purpose of condemning Chrysostom, assembled at a country seat of the minister Rufinus, ἡ δρῦς, a synod of bishops of the same mind with himself, or such as could be influenced (*Synodus ad Quercum*). Accusations were received from clergymen whom Chrysostom had deposed for their offences, — partly, manifest fictions, partly, garbled representations of innocent words and actions, and partly, such as only a Theophilus would regard as objections against a bishop (e. g. that Chrysostom neither gave nor attended feasts, and hence that he was an enemy to hospitality, etc.). Chrysostom, surrounded by a number of the most distinguished and worthy bishops, calmly awaited at Constantinople the action of the synod. As often as the synod summoned him through an imperial legate, the bishops at Constantinople protested against the competency of the tribunal. Chrysostom, on the contrary, declared his readiness to appear before the synod. provided that only three of his declared enemies were withdrawn from the number of his judges. This was refused, and, by a decree of the synod confirmed by the imperial court, Chrysostom was excommunicated, deposed, and exiled to Bithynia. But the violent tumults of the people, who revered their patriarch, together with an earthquake that happened at this time, alarmed the empress. She hastily recalled Chrysostom, in 403, whose return was like a triumphal march, and who was forced by the affection of his people, against his own judgment, to bestow the episcopal benediction upon them, before a new and regularly called synod could declare the decision of the preceding one null and void. Theophilus made use of this for new machinations. Having come to an agreement with the Origenistic monks at the last mentioned synod, Theophilus had hurried back to Alexandria, and no longer ventured to come again into the vicinity of Constantinople; while Chrysostom, on his part, did not cease to petition the emperor to convene a new synod. But though absent, Theophilus was able to give instructions to his own friends and the enemies of Chrysostom at Constantinople. Furthermore, the request of Chrysostom for a new synod failed of success, because of the anger of Eudoxia, which had been newly awakened by the rebuke which the patriarch had administered, for the interruption of public worship by the festivities connected with the dedication of a statue of the empress, and by an inconsiderate allusion in one of his sermons.[1] Chrysostom was again sent into exile, in the summer of 404, to Cucusus, between Armenia and Cilicia. Under his varied sufferings and privations, his Christian greatness of soul now shone forth in an illustrious manner. He still kept up a constant communication with his flock,[2] and labored unceasingly for the welfare of the church and the spread of Christianity.[3] In the year 407 he was sent into a still severer exile, to the wretched city Pityus on the Black Sea; but the wearisomeness of the journey was too much for him. For three months he had wandered up and down with two soldiers. He was exhausted. Near the city Comanum in Pontus, in a martyr's chapel, he felt that death was near at hand. He put on a white garment, partook of the sacrament with serene joy, and died, Sept. 14th, with the watch-word of his whole life upon his lips: *Δόξα τῷ θεῷ πάντων ἕνεκεν.* In vain had *Innocent I.*, bishop of Rome, interceded for him. A separation between the Roman and Greek churches was the temporary consequence of the injustice done to this venerated man; until thirty years afterwards, in the reign of Theodosius II., his bones were brought back in triumph to Constantinople. Full honor was now done to his memory in the Greek church, and the Johannites returned into its communion.

---

[1] Chrysostom, foreseeing the coming storm, is reported to have opened his sermon, on the festival of John the Baptist, with the words: "Once more Herodias rages, — once more she demands the head of John." Socrat. H. E. VI. 16; Sozom. VIII. 20.

[2] Between Chrysostom's first exile in 403, and his second in 404, the violent treatment which he had received produced a schism at Constantinople. His flock continued true to their bishop, and, on being driven from their church, continued to worship in private dwellings, and in the fields, — being even here exposed to attacks of violence. This fidelity continued down to the death of Chrysostom, and after. The church refused to acknowledge the bishops that were appointed to succeed Chrysostom, and bore the name of *Johannites*.

[3] To encourage and console his friends in Constantinople, he wrote his tract *Ὅτι τὸν ἑαυτὸν μὴ ἀδικοῦντα οὐδεὶς παραβλάψαι δύναται.*

Amidst these attacks upon Chrysostom, the properly Origenistic controversies were forgotten, and it was not until the middle of the 6th century that they incidentally broke out anew during the Monophysite controversy, to be settled adversely to Origen (See § 90).[1]

---

[1] During these Origenistic controversies, though not directly affected by them, lived *Synesius* of Cyrene, towards the close of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th century. Until past middle life, he had been a thoughtful and highly esteemed pagan, whose contemplative spirit was much attracted to Platonism. In the year 409 or 410 he was unanimously chosen bishop of Ptolemais, although he was married, and perhaps as yet unbaptized. He did not conceal the fact that his views on many points,—especially respecting the pre-existence of the human soul, the end of the world, and the resurrection of the body,—were different from the church doctrine. But the clergy commended him to the teachings of the Holy Spirit; and although his doctrines were the same which Theophilus of Alexandria had condemned as Origenistic, yet the Alexandrine bishop confirmed the election. Synesius died about 431. The most important of his writings are: Libb. II. Περὶ προνοίας; *Dion* (upon the relation of scientific culture to the immediate intuition of divine things); Lib. I. Περὶ ἐνυπνίων (an investigation of the Platonic ideas); 10 *Hymns;* Περὶ βασιλείας (a politico-religious address to the emperor Arcadius); and 156 *Letters.* Opp. ed. Petavius, Par. 1612. Comp. Clausen De Synesio philosopho.

Controversies relating to the Person of Christ.

§ 87.

TILL THE NESTORIAN CONTROVERSY.

Similar to the Arian controversy, but more subtle and distracting, was the controversy concerning *The personal union of the two natures in Christ.* The union of the deity and the humanity of Jesus, without mixture and without division, into one theanthropic Person, gives character to the entire work of Christ as a Redeemer; and it was a doctrine substantially asserted in the church from the first, in opposition to deviations upon both sides. In the preceding period *Tertullian*, and particularly *Origen*,[1] had maintained it in opposition to the Docetae and other Gnostics, who denied the existence of a real human body, and to some extent also of a true human soul, in Christ; in opposition to the Patripassians, who denied the existence of a true human soul in his Person; in opposition to the Ebionites, who denied the existence in Christ of a divine nature, and, particularly, in opposition to the Samosatenians, who asserted only a divine inspiration of the man Jesus, by the power of God; and, lastly, in opposition to a party of Gnostics who denied the real and true union of both natures in his Person. At the same time, as these early fathers sought only to hold the doctrine in its more general form, and avoided nicer definitions, something was still wanting in order to a complete scientific statement of it. Even if both deity and humanity, and a certain union of both, were conceded to Christ's Person, still, two extremes were possible, neither of which was the revealed and exact truth. The union might be either too lax, or too strict. On the one hand, by asserting the existence of both natures in *independent separation* from each other, and forbidding the transfer of the predicates of both to the one Person, the true and real unity of the Personage was denied,—there being in reality two persons, a divine and a human, standing side by side, whereby the theanthropic character of Christ was lost, and even his pure and simple deity also. On the other hand, the union of the two natures might be so represented as to fuse them into a unique third nature, to which neither the attributes of deity nor of humanity belong,—a method which would, indeed, save the complexity of character, but would destroy both the strict deity and the strict humanity of Christ's complex Person.

---

[1] *Tertullian* (Adv. Prax. c. 27, et alia) argues, that upon the scheme of the Patripassians, — who, in order to prove the identity of deity in Christ with the Father's deity, were wont to regard the incarnation of God as merely the assumption of a human body only, — neither true deity nor true humanity could be attributed to Christ. He asserts that the deity and the humanity in Jesus has, each, its own peculiar attributes; and that there is a "duplex status, non confusus, sed conjunctus in una persona." *Origen* discriminates still more sharply, — in affirming that the human soul in Christ is the natural and adapted organ of the Logos, just as the human body is the organ of the human soul, in an ordinary man. It is the highest end of the finite soul in the complex person of Christ, to surrender itself wholly to the Logos as its organ. This, the soul of a common man does only momentarily; but the soul in Jesus, with which the Logos united itself, did it continually, — not merely in *κοινωνία* but in *ἀνάκρασις*, and for the purpose of mediatorship between the Logos and all other souls. T. XIX. 5, in Joh.; De princ. II. 6; IV. 31; Con. Cels. VI. 47.

In this period, the doctrine of the Person of Christ first came into discussion during the Arian controversies. The *Arians*,—whose interest it was to make those passages of scripture which speak of a rational human nature in Christ prove a species of secondary divinity in him,—following in the track of those errorists who had been combatted by Tertullian and Origen, denied the existence of a true human soul in Jesus, and held that the Logos had united itself with a human body only. Against this Arian view, the church fathers now defended the doctrine of the real and proper humanity of Christ, in union with his deity; while, on the other hand, they asserted a real and proper deity of Christ in union with his humanity, in opposition to the view of *Marcellus of Ancyra*,[1] and the Samosatenian *Photinus* who held to merely a divine influence upon the man Jesus (comp. § 84).[1] A new controversy was occasioned by the acute and learned defender of the Nicene council, *Apollinaris* the younger, bishop of Laodicea († 382);[2] who, in order to explain the nature of the union of the two natures, adopted the current division of human nature into three parts, — *σῶμα*, *ψυχὴ ἄλογος* (the vital principle), and *ψυχὴ λογική* (*νοῦς* or *πνεῦμα*), — and affirmed that the divine Logos itself, the *νοῦς θεῖος*, took the place of the *ψυχὴ λογική*. Against Apollinaris therefore, as well as against the Arians whose theory he merely refined and perfected, the church was once more compelled to assert the union with deity, of a humanity that was perfect and complete in respect to body, soul, and *spirit*.[3]

---

[1] According to Marcellus, the divine Logos merely dwelt in the human nature of Christ in a Sabellian mode; so that the entire consciousness and personality

From this time onward, were gradually formed, within the general limits of the Catholic church, two diverging tendencies, in respect to the doctrine of the union of deity and humanity in Christ, according as the theologians sought to avoid the Photinian, or the Apollinariano-Arian extreme. In and by the conflict of these two, there resulted, in process of time, a middle third, which, though standing far nearer to

---

of Christ was only a particular modification of the divine Logos-power, and ceased altogether, when the *ἐνέργεια δραστικὴ τοῦ λόγου* was again absorbed into the universal *ἐνέργεια τοῦ θεοῦ*.

[1] The Arian and Photinian theories were now the two opposite errors respecting the Person of Christ, — the former confounding the divine and the human in Christ, and, at the same time, not acknowledging the humanity in its distinctness; the latter acknowledging, indeed, the complete humanity, but not holding to a union of deity and humanity. The pure church doctrine, as it was expressed by *Athanasius* in the Alexandrine synod of 362, held the central position between these two extremes, yet upon such a breadth of base as not to hinder a more complete construction in the future.

[2] Fragments of the Epistles of Apollinaris, and of his two treatises *Περὶ πίστεως*, and *Απόδειξις περὶ τῆς θείας σαρκώσεως*, are to be found in Gallandi Bibl. patr. T. XII. p. 706; also in Theodoret. Haer. fabb. IV. 8, 9. Comp. Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. V. 3—9; Socrat. Hist. Eccl. II. 46; Sozom. V. 18; VI. 25.

[3] This was done by *Athanasius*, Contra Apollinarium (§ 85); by *Gregory Nyssa*, —*Ἀντιῤῥητικὸς πρὸς τὰ Ἀπολιναρίου*, in Gallandi Bibl. patr. VI. p. 517, — who conceives of the union of the deity and humanity as a *σύναψις κατ' οὐσιαν* (there are two natures *εἰς ἕν συνδραμοῦσαι*), and, in opposition to Photinianism and Apollinarianism, would designate the Virgin Mary as not merely *ἀνθρωποτόκος* but *θεοτόκος*; and also by the council of Constantinople 381 (Can. 7).

one than to the other, became general and authoritative within the church. On the one side, the contemplative *Alexandrine Church* was chiefly concerned to hold fast and firm the inseparable thoroughness of the *union* of the two natures;[1] emphasizing the ineffable, the *ἄφατον*, in this blending of deity and humanity, and not hesitating, — in accordance with the principle that to the God-man, both deity and humanity equally belong,[2] — to transfer the predicates of the divine nature to the human, and vice versa.[3] This was a tendency, it is obvious to remark, exceedingly liable to extravagance or positive error in its phraseology and modes of statement. On the other side, the *Antiochian Church* strove to make clear to the understanding the union of the two natures; they were anxiously careful to separate the divine from the human,[4] would concede only a *ἕνωσις κατ᾽ εὐδοκίαν, κατὰ χάριν, καϑ᾽ υἱοϑεσίαν*,[5] and avoided the mutual transfer of predicates as leading to a mixture and confusion of the natures. The head and representative of this school, during this period (comp. § 60, 70, 81), was *Theodorus* († 429) bishop of Mopsuestia in Syria,[6] — a man distinguished not merely for his adherence to a strictly grammatico-historical exegesis of Scripture, but also for his scientific spirit. This latter sometimes carried him to the verge of rationalism;[1] while at the same time it was stimulated by the conflict which the Antiochian school was compelled to wage with the remnants of Gnostics, Manichaeans, and Apollinarians. Such being the character of the two parties, it was natural that the Antiochians, especially in case of rash or inaccurate statements on the part of the Alexandrines, should charge them with mixing and fusing the divine and human in Christ into a third single nature, whereby both the pure deity and the pure humanity were alike lost;[2] while, on the other hand, the Alexandrines with yet more reason would see in the theory of the Antiochians the still greater danger of separating the two natures of Christ, and forming two persons out of the deity and humanity, — thereby unclothing the latter of the dignity it derives from a true *union* with the former, and destroying the *theanthropic* character of

---

[1] Its symbol was: *εἷς Χριστὸς ἐκ δυοῖν φύσεων ἀφράστως, ἀπερινοήτως, ἀῤῥήτως ἑνούμενος.*

[2] The divine and human natures were, indeed, to be distinguished in abstracto; but in concreto, in the Person of Christ, neither nature should be considered by itself, otherwise, no true union, — no *ἕνωσις φυσική* in distinction from *ἕνωσις σχετική*, — could obtain.

[3] Hence the phrase: "the Logos was crucified;" and the epithet *ἡ ϑεοτόκος* applied to Mary by Didymus. Previous to this, Clemens Alex. (Protrept. p. 66) had said: *πίστευσον, ἄνϑρωπε, ἀνϑρώπῳ καὶ ϑεῳ, τῷ παϑόντι καὶ προσκυνουμενῷ ϑεῷ* and Tatian. C. Graec. 13: *ὁ πεπονϑὼς ϑεός.* Cyril remarks: *ἡ τοῦ Κυρίου σάρξ ἐστιν ἰδία τοῦ ϑεοῦ λόγου*, but guards immediately by the negative, — *οὐχ ἑτέρου τινὸς παρ᾽ αὐτον.*

[4] They emphasized, in the *ἕνοσις*, the *ἀσυγχύτως* and *ἀτρέπτως*, instead of the *ἀφράστος.*

[5] *Diodorus* bishop of Tarsus, who belonged to this school, in the most decided manner opposed the transfer of predicates, and, in opposition to Apollinarianism particularly, compared the union of deity with humanity in Christ with the peculiar relation in which God has stood to other favored men, by will and grace (*ἕνωσις κατ᾽ εὐδοκίαν* etc.), and taught that there was a progressive revelation of the divine in Jesus, parallel to the ordinary progressive development of human nature.

[6] Of the important Biblical Commentaries of *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, as well

---

as of his Dogmatic Writings (*De incarnatione*, *Contra Eunomium*, *Contra Magiam Pers.*, *Contra defensores peccati originalis*, *Interpretatio fidei Nicaenae*), only fragments remain; with the exception of his Commentary upon the twelve Minor Prophets, which has been edited in part by Wegnern, Berol. 1834. Theodore was revered by the Eastern church, and particularly by the Nestorian portion of it, as the "Interpreter." His somewhat rash criticism of the N. T. Canon, and of the Messianic psalms, — of which he acknowledged but four, — together with a somewhat lax view of inspiration, elicited many attacks upon him in his own day, and brought upon the Antiochian school a suspicion which was relieved in part only by the Christian gravity and judgment of a *Chrysostom* and *Theodoret* (§ 86, 88). Compare Fritzsche De Theodori Mopsvestensi vita et scriptis.

[1] It is noticeable that the exegetico-grammatical school of Antioch, as well as the allegorizing Alexandrine, adopted and maintained the doctrine of restoration. In respect to the latitudinarian peculiarities of the historically important system of Theodore, see § 92.

[2] This charge is not to be regarded as in every instance well-founded, and that too even when some of the ante-Chalcedonic Alexandrines speak of only one nature in Christ; for, as before the Nicene council the distinction between *ὑπόστασις* and *οὐσία* was ill-defined and fluctuating, though then and afterwards earnestly insisted upon, so, previous to the council of Chalcedon the distinction between "nature" and "person" was undetermined and vague, although the conceptions themselves were firmly grasped. *Athanasius*, e. g., employs the following phraseology: *Ὁμολογοῦμεν οὐ δύο φύσεις τὸν ἕνα ϑεὸν, μίαν προσκυνητὴν καὶ μίαν ἀπροσκύνητον· ἀλλὰ μίαν φύσιν τοῦ ϑεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένην καὶ προσκυνουμένην μετὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ μιᾷ προσκυνήσει.* De incarnatione Verbi, Mansi IV. 689.

the Redeemer.[1] Both of these tendencies might, perhaps, have been harmonized, and should have been. But both parties, from the very first, went into the Nestorian controversy not only in doctrinal antagonism to each other, but also, — what was worst of all, — with more or less of earthly passion.

§ 88.

THE NESTORIAN CONTROVERSY.

Acts of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon; in Mansi T. IV. V. VII. Liberati Brevarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum; in Mansi T. IX. Socrates Hist. Eccles. VII. 29 sq. Evagrius Hist. Eccles. I. 7 sq. Walch Ketzerhistorie V—VIII. Baur Dreieinigkeitslehre I. 693 sq. Dorner Person Christi II. 1. 24 sq. Neander Church History II. 446—524.

The Nestorian controversy broke out in the East a few years after it had been opened by a prelude in the West. *Leporius*, a monk and presbyter of Southern Gaul, and adopting Pelagian views,[2] had attacked the doctrine of the transfer of the predicates of the human to the divine, and had been excommunicated; but was afterwards brought to see his error and renounce it, by Augustine (in 426).

For some time, the rising power of the patriarch of Constantinople had awakened the jealousy of the Alexandrine patriarch (§ 86). The patriarchate of Alexandria, after the death of *Theophilus*, had passed, in 412, into the hands of his nephew *Cyril* († 444), — a man zealous for the orthodox doctrine of the church, but not free from worldly ambition and violent passions.[3] During his administration, *Nestorius*, an Antiochian monk and presbyter, a pupil of Theodore of Mopsuestia, became patriarch of Constantinople in 428. *Anastasius*, a presbyter whom Nestorius brought with him from Antioch, took offence at the frequent use at Constantinople of the epithet ἡ ϑεοτόκος applied to Mary, and spoke against it in public and with inconsiderate vehemence. This was the more offensive at Constantinople, because it was regarded as an attack upon the dignity of the Virgin Mother, and because the opposite doctrine had been zealously preached there by a resident presbyter *Proclus*. Soon Anastasius passed for one who denied the divine nature of Christ. Nestorius, instead of composing the difference between the parties, sided actively with his presbyter,[1] and occasioned similar charges of Photinianism and Samosatenianism against himself.[2] Cyril of Alexandria now began to mingle in the strife, taking sides in favor of the term ϑεοτόκος. After an epistolary controversy between himself and Nestorius, he addressed the emperor a treatise *Περὶ τῆς ὀρϑῆς πίστεως*. Cyril and Nestorius now sent, each, a statement of the case to *Coelestinus* bishop of Rome. That of Nestorius was written in Greek only, with which the Roman bishop was unacquainted. The doctrine of the Roman church, at that time certainly, did not harmonize with that of Nestorius, — and neither did it in all particulars with that of Cyril, — and in the year 430, a synod at *Rome* condemned the doctrine of Nestorius, and excommunicated Nestorius himself in case he did not recant within ten days; committing, at the same time, the execution of the decision to Cyril. In vain did the patriarch *John* of Antioch, in the name of his colleagues, entreat Nestorius to commence no new strife on account of a word which it was possible to employ in a correct sense, as he himself conceded. Nestorius excused himself as well as he could, but persisted in his previous course; and now his own polemic zeal and passionate imprudence brought Cyril himself into conflict with the Syrian bishops, by a measure of his own, which changed the controversy from the personal form it had previousy assumed, into a decided conflict between the Alexandrine and the Antiochian systems. Cyril drew up twelve formulae of recantation, *ἀναϑεματισμοί* (in Mansi T. IV. p. 1067 sq.), which, in the name of a synod at *Alexandria* in 430, were prescribed to Nestorius for adoption, and in which, urging the Alexandrine doctrine into a one-sided extreme, and into the sharpest contrariety to the Antiochian, he conceded the distinction of natures in Christ *in abstracto*, but denied it wholly *in concreto*.[1] In this, the Syrian bishops saw a direct attack upon the doctrine of their church, and a manifest proclivity to a detestable Monophysitism; and now, not only Nestorius drew up twelve violent counter anathemas, but several other bishops of the Antiochian school, — particularly *Theodoret* († 457) bishop of Cyrus on the Euphrates,[2] in his *'Ανατροπή*, — wrote replies in opposition. For the settlement of the controversy, the emperor *Theodosius II.* called the *third oecumenical council*, at *Ephesus*, in 431. In spite of the earnest entreaties of his well-disposed friends, and particularly of the abbot *Isidore* of Pelusium,[3] Cyril determined by a bold movement to use the council as the instrument of his own designs. Before the arrival of John and most of the bishops connected with the Antiochian diocese, who had been providentially delayed, he opened the council in connection with *Memnon* bishop of Ephesus, notwithstanding the protestation of Nestorius and his friends, and in one day condemned the doctrine of Nestorius, deposed and excommunicated him, and set forth the substance of the twelve Anathemas as the normal faith of the church. Displeased at this, the Syrian and other Oriental bishops, who had now arrived, held a council of their own, in which they annulled the decisions of the first council, declared Cyril's doctrine heretical, and deposed and excommunicated both him and Memnon. On the other hand, the Roman legates recognized the first council as the legitimate and true one. Nevertheless, the schism between the two portions of what was intended to be one general council continued. The emperor desired to remove the scandal of such an oecumenical council, by a new investigation; but Nestorius, aware of the preponderating influence of the party of Cyril at court and among the monks, petitioned the emperor for leave to retire into his former cloister. John, and the Oriental bishops who sided with him, now continually urged the emperor to legitimate the decrees of their council. The emperor caused deputies from both parties to appear before him, at Chalcedon; but on their dismissal in 432 everything remained in statu quo, — Nestorius deposed, and that too irrevocably, Cyril and Memnon in honor, and the adherents of the Alexandrine and Antiochian systems in still more violent antagonism with each other. Both parties, as well as the emperor, saw the evil of this state of things, and all now began earnestly to desire and strive for peace. Cyril, perhaps conscious of his former haste in drawing up his doctrinal statement, sacrificed, at least for

---

[1] In defining this *ἕνωσις* of deity and humanity in the Person of Christ, Cyril of Alexandria remarks: *Ὁ τῆς ἑνώσεως λόγος οὐκ ἀγνοεῖ μὲν τὴν διαφορὰν τῆς ϑεότητος καὶ ἀνϑρωπότητος, ἐξίστησι δὲ τὴν διαίρεσιν· οὐ συγχεύων τὰς φύσεις, ἀλλ' ὅτι σαρκὸς μετεσχηκὼς ὁ λόγος εἷς δὴ νοεῖται.*

[2] Cassian. De incarnatione Christi I. 4; Gennadius De vir. ill. c. 59.

[3] Of his writings, — besides the work against Julian § 64, — there are extant: *Adv. Nestorium libb. V.;* a work Κατὰ 'Ανϑρωπομορφιτῶν; *De Trinitate dialogg. libb. VII.;* upon "*Prayer* in spirit and in truth;" *Homilies;* several allegorizing *Biblical Commentaries;* and 61 *Epistolae*. Opp. ed Aubert. Paris, 1638. 7 vols. fol.

---

[1] The sermons (*δμιλίαι*) which he preached at that time, and of which Greek fragments remain (Mansi IV., 1197), have been preserved in a Latin version by his contemporary and opponent Mercator.

[2] Nestorius, somewhat later in the controversy, granted that the expression ϑεοτόκος κατὰ σαρκα was perhaps allowable; but affirmed that the term Χριστοτόκος was the more accurate one. Nestor. Ep. 3 ad Coelestinum.

---

[1] After the incarnation of the Son of God, the distinction of two natures no longer existed.

[2] Of the writings of this excellent bishop and able exegete, there are extant: *Commentaries* on the O. T., and the Pauline Epistles; *Historia Ecclesiastica libb. V.; Haereticorum fabular. libb. V.* (Αἱρετικῆς κακομυϑίας ἐπιτομή, — an account of then existing heresies, including Nestorianism); Φιλόϑεος ἱστορία sc. *Historia religiosa* (on the life of distinguished monks); the *Apologetic* work mentioned in § 64, and 181 *Epistolae;* Πέντε λόγοι περὶ ἐνανϑρωπήσεως (against Cyril and his course at Ephesus); 'Ερανιστής (an important work addressed to the emperor in defence of the Antiochian view of the Person of Christ); Λόγοι περὶ προνοίας (a theodicy in 10 books); Περὶ τῆς ϑείας καὶ ἁγίας ἀγάπης (defending the veneration of martyrs); *Dialogues* respecting the Trinity. Opp. ed. Sirmond. Par. 1642. 4 voll. fol.; and Schulze et Noesselt. Hal. 1769. 10 vols., with Baueri Glossarium Theodoreteum. Respecting his life and writings, see Garnerii Dissertationes, and the last volume of the Halle edition.

[3] Isidore of Pelusium (d. about 440), a model of cloister virtue, originally belonging to Alexandria, but through the influence of Chrysostom favorably

---

inclined towards the Antiochian school, has left a collection of over 2000 *Letters*, of great value for the history of morals and exegesis. They also indicate a tolerant and broad scientific spirit, and at the same time a bold temper towards civil and ecclesiastical authority. Epp. libb. IV., edited at Paris 1638; Venice 1745. Comp. **Niemeyer** De Isidori Pelus. vita, scriptis, et doctrina.

the moment and in part, the doctrinal interest to the personal, while John sacrificed the personal interest to the doctrinal. John ratified the verdict against Nestorius, and Cyril subscribed, in 433, a confession of faith very similar to that drawn up at Ephesus by Theodoret in justification of the Antiochian party, — a symbol in its main points Antiochian in doctrine, and not consistent with the strict Alexandrine system, without some torturing.[1] The Alexandrine bishop, however, was not required to formally retract his own twelve Anathemas. A formal union of this sort, while the real doctrinal divergences continued, naturally did not meet with the approval of all, and contained the tinder for a new and later controversy. Zealous Alexandrines, as well as zealous Antiochians, saw in it only the betrayal of the truth; while upright and influential Syrian bishops, like *Theodoret*, *Alexander* of Hierapolis, and *Meletius* of Mopsuestia, could not acquiesce in the apparently unjust judgment respecting Nestorius. Under the pressure of the imperial command, and the requisition of his patriarch John of Antioch, Theodoret finally yielded for the sake of his church; especially as he was not compelled to subscribe to the condemnation of Nestorius. Meletius and Alexander were deposed and banished. The contest was now ended for the present, and Nestorius was entirely at the mercy of his bitter enemies at court, who never forgot the earnest rebukes contained in his sermons. After spending four years in a cloister he was banished to one of the Egyptian oases, where even the barbarians showed compassion to him. He was afterwards dragged about from one place of exile to another, in Thebais, until, in wretchedness and poverty, he died about 440. His writings were burnt by the emperor's orders, and only some of his sermons and letters are extant.

It is natural, after this survey of the Nestorian controversy, to cast a glance back upon the two principal persons concerned in it. It is undeniably evident that great injustice was done to *Nestorius* personally. But, on the other hand, he was (logically) not free from material error; for his lax view of the union of the two natures in Christ, leading him to refuse the attribution of both classes of attributes to the resultant unity, would certainly destroy the true theanthropic personality of Christ, so that Christ would be only a mere man who stood in a certain peculiar, although very near, connection with God. And neither was *Cyril* wholly free from doctrinal error; while his temper was often passionate and unchristian in a high degree. He indeed defended strongly the doctrine of the *God-man;* but he was not sufficiently careful to guard against being understood to deny the permanent and continued existence of the two distinct natures in the one theanthropic Person, — an error which was also committed by the oecumenical council at Ephesus in that first sitting, and which it was reserved for the council of Chalcedon (§ 89) afterwards to avoid, in the full and formal statement of the pure doctrine. Nevertheless, the error on the side of Cyril was more formal than material; while on the side of Nestorius it was more material than formal.

---

[1] The articles of agreement drawn up by *John* of Antioch specified: that Christ, as to his Godhead was of equal essence with the Father, and as to his humanity of equal essence with mankind; that on account of the union of both natures, — which union was to be carefully distinguished from confusion or mixture, — one Christ was to be confessed, in reference to whom Mary might be called ϑεοτόκος.

Yet the memory of the so severely persecuted Nestorius continued to be dear, century after century, to a great body of Christians outside of the Roman empire. During the Nestorian controversy, there were laboring in the *Theological School at Edessa* (§ 70), where Christian teachers and preachers were trained for the church in Persia, two decided and zealous adherents of the Antiochian system: the presbyter *Ibas*, afterwards bishop of Edessa (436—457), and *Thomas Barsumas*. Both were violently persecuted by *Rabulas*, bishop of Edessa, who, at a synod, passed sentence of condemnation not only upon the Nestorians, but also upon Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia. Ibas gave an account of this arbitrary procedure in a letter to the Persian bishop *Maris* of Hardaschir. This bishop had already contributed to the spread of Nestorianism in the Persian church, by translating into Syriac, the language used by the

Persian Christians, various writings of Diodorus and Theodore. Nestorianism was still further strengthened in Persia, by the flight of Barsumas thither, and his appointment as bishop of Nisibis (435—489), and by the favor shown, from political considerations, to the Nestorian church by the Persian kings, who desired to widen still further the separation between the Persian and the Roman Christians. At length, at a synod in 499, the entire *Persian Church* declared for the Nestorian doctrine, and received from *Babaeus* (496) the bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon (its supreme bishop, *Catholicus*, or *Jazelich*), a more definite creed-statement, and a constitution which permitted the marriage of bishops and presbyters, and was specially adapted to promote schools and education. They were called *Nestorians* by their opponents; though calling themselves *Chaldaean-Christians*, from their use of the Chaldee-Syriac language, and, in East India, *Thomas-Christians*, from one of their first teachers, Mar Thomas, or perhaps from the Apostle Thomas himself.[1]

§ 89.

EUTYCHIAN CONTROVERSY.

Authorities cited in § 88. Gelasii I. Breviculus Historiae Eutychianistarum (in Mansi, T. VII. p. 1060 sq.). Leontius Byzantius (about 600) Contra Eutychianos et Nestorianos (in Gallandi Bibl. Patr. T. XII. p. 658 sq.). Salig De Eutychianismo ante Eutychem. Neander Church History II. 504 sq. Dorner Person Christi II, 1. 103 sq. Baur Dreieinigkeitslehre I. 778 sq.

The mode in which the Nestorian controversy had been settled by no means removed or harmonized the internal antagonisms between the two parties. In Egypt, there was still as eager an endeavor as ever to obtain universal validity for the Alexandrine statements concerning the Person of Christ, in roughest opposition to the Antiochian doctrine, which was declared to be Nestorianism; while the Syrian theologians, on the other hand, strongly supported by the recent confession of faith signed by Cyril, charged monophysitism upon the Egyptian doctrine, and vehemently opposed it. The need of some positive dogmatic statement of the doctrine of the Person of Christ was felt more and more widely, since the general council at Ephesus had yielded only a negative result for the church as a whole. But the true and pure expansion of the revealed truth was again hindered, for a time, by the worldly mind of an Alexandrine patriarch. Cyril was succeeded, in 444, by *Dioscurus* (444—451), — a man much more passionate and violent than himself even, whose zeal for orthodoxy was vitiated still more than was Cyril's by the peculiarities of personal character, and who, perhaps, from the very moment of entering upon his office, aimed to bring about a new outbreak of the controversy, or rather a new attack upon the Constantinopolitan patriarchate. The occasion for this was afforded by *Eutyches*, an aged archimandrite at Constantinople, an honest, plain and strict anti-Nestorian adherent of the Alexandrine system, who, probably while conceding a distinction of natures in abstracto and denying it in concreto, expressed himself in such a manner as to imply that Christ possessed two natures before the incarnation, but that after this event there was only one,[1] — since in and by the incarnating act the human was entirely absorbed and transmuted into the divine, and there was then but a single nature. In connection with this, he denied, in phraseology which had a suspicious sound, the consubstantiality of Christ's body with the bodies of men generally.[2] A complaint was brought against him, by *Eusebius* bishop of Dorylaeum, before a synod held at Constantinople in 448 under the presidency of the patriarch *Flavian*,[1] and as he refused to retract his position he was deposed and excommunicated. Eutyches found, however, powerful friends at court, particularly the minister *Chrysaphius*, Flavian's bitter opposer, and even the empress *Eudocia* herself; while Dioscurus stood ready to assist him at any moment. A new council, pretending to be a general one, but from which bishops of the Antiochian school were excluded, met at *Ephesus* in 449, to settle the difficulty. Though its decisions in doctrinal respects were not so reprehensible, its mode of procedure was so in the highest degree. The council was the blind tool of the passion and unheard-of violence of Dioscurus, and of an excited rabble; and hence, after 451, was designated as the Robber-synod, *σύνοδος ληστρική*. This synod did not, indeed, venture to lay down a counter statement to the Antiochian doctrine in the rough monophysite Eutychian manner, but, under the pretext that nothing new must be added to the decisions of the Nicene council, did not hesitate to brand as Nestorianism everything which contradicted the Egyptian dogmatism, and to depose and banish Flavian, Theodoret, and other excellent bishops. In this momentary triumph of a manifestly growing monophysitism, no resource was left to the oppressed party but to appeal to the powerful Roman bishop *Leo the Great*. He had already, in the beginning of the controversy, in an *Epistola ad Flavianum* (Ep. 28, Leon. Opera), declared against Eutychianism, and had endeavored, with remarkable acuteness, to conciliate and harmonize in a higher unity the antagonistic positions of Eutychianism or Monophysitism, and Nestorianism,—maintaining the doctrine of two natures in Christ, each distinct and having its distinctive attributes, and both acting in the unity of a single personality.[2] This letter, Leo's legate sought to have read to the synod, as the norm for the doctrinal statement to be made; but by the artifice of Dioscurus the letter was not read, and Leo merely received, at a later day, an appeal from Flavian to a new and regular council. Leo continually urged the convening of such a council, but in vain, until in 450 the death of Theodosius II. and the accession of *Pulcheria* and *Marcianus* to the throne altered the whole condition of affairs. In the year 451 the *fourth oecumenical council* assembled at *Chalcedon*, for the union of parties, and the removal of manifold distractions in the Oriental church, and put an end to the machinations of Dioscurus. The first draft of a formula of agreement presented to the council, — which defined that Christ exists *of* two natures (a statement granted by the Monophysites), and involved only a distinction of natures in abstracto but not in concreto, — was very acceptable to the Monophysite party; but the Roman deputies and the Syrian bishops protested against it. In making a new draft, *Leo's* letter served as the guide and rule of statement. It was authoritatively laid down, that "the one Son of God, Christ, is perfectly and truly God, and also perfectly and truly man, in respect to his Godhead of equal essence with the Father, in respect to his humanity of equal essence with us, like ourselves in all respects, sin excepted, and that *this one Christ*, the Son of God, the Lord, the Only-begotten, God, the Word, from eternity begotten of the Father as to his Godhead, born in time as to his humanity of Mary, the Virgin and *Mother of God* (*ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρϑένου τῆς ϑεοτόκου*), *exists* (is known) as one Person IN *two natures*,[1] which are united with each other *ἀσυγχυτως* and *ἀτρέπτως*, indeed, but also *ἀδιαιρέτῶς* and *ἀχωρίστως*;"[2] and, accordingly, Eutychianism (the mixture and confusion of deity and humanity in one nature), as well as Nestorianism

---

[1] In modern times, the name Chaldaean-Christians has been given to those Nestorians who have united with the Roman Church. For information respecting the Nestorian Church see: Assemani Bibliotheca Orientalis, T. III. P. 2, p. 79 (De Syris Nestorianis); Ritter Geographie Bd. V.; Perkins Residence among the Nestorians.

---

[1] Ὁμολογῶ, ἐκ δύο φύσεων γεγεννῆσθαι τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν πρὸ τῆς ἑνώσεως· μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἕνωσιν μίαν φύσιν ὁμολογῶ (Mansi VI. 741 sq).

[2] Οὐ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν, τὴν δὲ ἁγίαν παρθένον ὁμολογῶ εἶναι ἡμῖν ὁμοούσιον κ. τ. λ. (Mansi VI. 741 sq.).

---

[1] A so-called *σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα*, composed of bishops who happened to be in Constantinople at the time.

[2] "Salva proprietate utriusque naturae et substantiae et in unam coëunte personam, . . in integra veri hominis perfectaque natura verus natus est Deus, totus in suis, totus in nostris, . . humana augens, divina non minuens. . . Tenet enim sine defectu proprietatem suam utraque natura. . . Agit utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est, Verbo scilicet operante quod Verbi est, et carne exsequente quod carnis est."

---

[1] *ἐν δύο φύσεσιν*. The reading *ἐκ δύο φύσεων* in Greek manuscripts, for which all the Latin authorities read in duabus naturis, is manifestly a false one (See Mansi T. VII. p. 775; Walch Bibl. symb. vet. p. 106; Gieseler Church History,, § 89, Note 11).

[2] *That* this is so was affirmed; *how* this is so was the only remaining obscure point, around which there might be room for a species of Nestorianizing.

(either a gross or a subtle division of the deity and humanity into two persons), were both alike condemned.[1] Dioscurus was deposed by the synod, on the ground of many serious accusations brought against him; but he was so little abashed by this that he excommunicated the Roman bishop in return. Theodoret, on the contrary, on reluctantly yielding to the vehement pressure of the synod upon him, and pronouncing the anathema upon Nestorius and all who refused to call Mary ϑεοτόκος, yet immediately leaving the synod after it, was restored to his bishopric. The Chalcedon definitions, though clearly and strongly enunciating the pure doctrine as to its substance, were not completely exhaustive and perfect as to the formal statement. The Chalcedon symbol, not altogether avoiding the appearance of a preference for the Nestorian extreme rather than the Eutychian, though energetically condemning and carefully guarding against both, awakened suspicions in suspicious minds, which finally broke forth in the Monophysite controversies of a later date.

§ 90.

MONOPHYSITE AND CONNECTED CONTROVERSIES.

Authorities cited in § 88, 89. Leontius Byzantius De sectis liber, actio 5—10, (in Gallandi Bibl. Patr. XII. 621 sq.). Dorner Person Christi II, 1. 158 sq. Baur Dreieinigkeitslehre II. 37—96. Neander Church History II. 524—550.

Although there was no valid reason for it, it was nevertheless natural, that that portion of the Egyptian party which urged the distinctive peculiarity of the Egyptian Christology to the verge of the Monophysite heresy, should see in the Chalcedon statement a plain leaning towards Nestorianism, and should violently oppose it upon this ground. From the opposition of this party to the council of Chalcedon sprang the distracting Monophysite controversies, which, although they produced no positive doctrinal results, on account of the comparative unimportance of the questions raised, yet had the negative effect of removing still further from the Catholic doctrine all Nestorianism and Nestorian influences.

---

[1] The Symbolum Chalcedonense (Mansi VII. 108) defines the Person of Christ as follows: Ἐκδιδάσκομεν τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ϑεότητι καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνϑρωπότητι, ϑεὸν ἀληϑῶς καὶ ἄνϑρωπον ἀληϑῶς τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν ϑεότητα καὶ ὁμοούσιον τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνϑρωπότητα. κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας· πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηϑέντα κατὰ τὴν ϑεότητα, ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς ϑεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνϑοωπότητα· ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτόν Χοιστὸν, ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύ-

A dangerous outbreak among the monks in *Palestine*, headed by the monk Theodosius against the bishop Juvenalis of Jerusalem, and favored by the widowed empress Eudoxia, opened (451—453) the contest of which *Egypt* soon became the principal arena. *Proterius*, the successor of Dioscurus who had been deposed in 451 and had died in 454, by his vehemence embittered the already dissatisfied Monophysite party, at whose head stood the presbyter *Timotheus Ailurus* and the deacon *Peter Mongus*. Upon the accession of *Leo I.* to the throne, in 457, the Monophysites at Alexandria chose Timotheus for their patriarch, and Proterius lost his life in the popular tumult which arose upon this account. Both parties now petitioned for the imperial decision. Leo first obtained the opinion of all the principal bishops, and as the decided majority declared for the Chalcedon symbol, Ailurus was exiled, and *Timotheus Salophacialus*, a mild and wise Catholic theologian, was in 460 appointed in his place. He succeeded in preserving peace in the Egyptian church, until the expulsion in 476 of the new emperor *Zeno Isauricus* by *Basiliscus* made itself felt injuriously in Egypt. Making use of ecclesiastical controversy as an instrument of promoting his political designs, Basiliscus strengthened his party by siding with the Monophysites. The attempt to compel subscription to the circular-letter (*'Εγκύκλιον*) which he had issued in favor of the Monophysites, and in opposition to the

τως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον, οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνῃρημένης διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, σωζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἰδιότητος ἑκατέρας φύσεως καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης· οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον.

Chalcedon symbol, excited violent outbreaks in many places and, among others, in Egypt, where Timotheus Ailurus was now once more in the patriarchal chair, — outbreaks which were quieted somewhat by a second circular (*'Ανεγκύκλιον*) issued in 477 by Basiliscus, revoking his first one, and still more by the victory of Zeno over him in this same year. About this time (478), Timotheus the patriarch of Alexandria died. The Catholic party chose as his successor *John Talaya*, a presbyter and *Οἰκονομος* of the Alexandrine church; the Monophysites elected *Peter Mongus*. Talaya lost his principal support in losing the imperial minister Illus, who had rebelled against the emperor, and since in courting him he had neglected *Acacius* the influential patriarch of Constantinople, it was the more easy for Mongus to introduce to the patriarch, and through the patriarch to the emperor, his plan for uniting the contending parties, and so strengthen himself in the patriarchate of Alexandria. Zeno accordingly in 482 issued an *Henoticon*, which recommended an entire avoidance, in the statement of the doctrine of Christ's Person, of the expressions used in the controversy (Evagrii H. E. III. 14). With this ambiguous formulary of the emperor, the extreme Monophysites, (who now were called, in Egypt, *'Ακέφαλοι*, because they had separated from their patriarch Peter Mongus, who had subscribed and advocated the Henoticon,) were dissatisfied; while, on the other hand, the sincere friends of the Chalcedon symbol were still more dissatisfied with it, because they saw in it only a cunning artifice to promote Monophysitism. As a consequence, there ensued under Zeno, and still more during the reign of his like-minded successor *Anastasius* (491—518), a series of violent distractions and tumults, during which the Oriental church was left entirely to itself. The Roman bishops, with whom Talaya had taken refuge, constantly and with decision refused all church fellowship with the Monophysites, and from the year 484, when *Felix II.* of Rome anathematized Acacius of Constantinople (the first anathema that passed between the East and the West), until the year 519, all church communion between the East and West was interrupted.

Out of Egypt, the Monophysite controversy had, up to this time, awakened general attention principally in *Syria*,— and this through the zeal of *Peter* the *Fuller*, *Γναφεύς*, a Monophysite monk of Constantinople, who in 463 succeeded in seating himself in the chair of the patriarch of Antioch, but was banished by imperial orders about 470, yet took the patriarchal seat again in 485. After him, the Monophysites of Syria and the East generally were led by two distinguished and capable men, — bishop *Xenayas* or *Philoxenus*[1] of Mabug or Hierapolis in Syria, and the monk *Severus*, who afterwards became patriarch of Antioch. The latter abused the favor of Anastasius, to stir up serious disturbances at Constantinople. Peter Fuller had inserted in the liturgy, in connection with the word ϑεός in the Trisagion (§ 36), the favorite monophysite clause "Thou who hast been crucified for us." The attempt of Severus to introduce this at Constantinople produced the most violent disorder and tumult, even in public religious worship, and Anastasius deposed in succession two unworthy patriarchs of Constantinople. The general *Vitalianus* made use of the distractions now existing at many points to raise a rebellion against the emperor, and the latter found himself obliged in 514 to conclude a peace in favor of the Chalcedon decrees. But the victory of Chalcedon was not complete, until the reigns of *Justin I.* (518—527) and *Justinian I.* (527—565); the first of whom abolished the Henoticon, thereby rendering possible the restoration of church fellowship with Rome.[2]

In the reign of Justin many Monophysite bishops had been deposed, most of whom took refuge in Alexandria. The influx of so many bishops, taken in connection with the morbid hankering after subtilties and the love of disputation characteristic of Monophysitism, occasioned internal divisions among the Monophysites themselves, and the rise of fractional parties. The two principal divisions among them were: the *Phthartolatrae* (or *Severians* after the banished patriarch Severus), who, inclining more to the duophysite side, asserted the corruptibility of Christ's body; and the *Aphthartodocetae* (also *Phantasiasts*, and *Julianists* after bishop Julian of Halicarnassus), who asserted its incorruptibility. These latter, again, split into two sections: the *Actistetae*, who held that Christ's body was increate; and the *Ktistolatrae* who maintained the contrary. From the Phthartolatrae, there soon started out the *Agnöetae* (or *Themistians* after the deacon Themistius of Alexandria), who asserted that Christ as to his human nature was ignorant of many things,—a view which had been taken before this, in opposition to the general opinion, by Theodore of Mopsuestia. As a disregard for church authority continually grew and increased among the Monophysites, many other tendencies sprang up among them, and occasioned new divisions. Thus, *John Philoponus*, a philosopher and grammarian belonging to the Alexandrine Monophysites, following the example of *Ascusnages* a learned Monophysite of Constantinople, broached tritheism in a work published about 560, in which he made an erroneous application of the Aristotelian realism to the doctrine of the Trinity.[1] His adherents were called *Philoponiaci*, and *Tritheitae*. On the other hand, *Damian*, patriarch of Alexandria, appeared to fall into Sabellianism, his followers being called *Damianites;* and contemporaneously with him *Stephanus Niobes* denied any distinction of natures in Christ after their union in the incarnation, — in opposition to one portion of the Monophysites who were inclining to the Catholic duophysite view, and to the other and larger portion who held a middle position between him and the Catholic doctrine.

---

[1] Known as the opposer of image-worship, and the promoter of the Philoxenian Syriac translation of the New Testament, intended for the Monophysite church, in the place of the Peschito version made in the 2d century

[2] Among those who, about this time, wrote in behalf of the Chalcedon decisions in opposition to Nestorians and Eutychians, was the most learned man of his century, — the East-Gothic statesman, and Aristotelian philosopher *Boëthius*, — who died for his country, "the last of the Romans," in 525, by the sentence of an Arian king. Of his writings there are extant several theological works, particularly one on the Trinity; and the five books *De consolatione philosophiae* written in prison in prospect of death, — the contents of which do not testify to a profound apprehension of Christianity. Opp. Basil 1570. fol. See Gervaise Histoire de Boëce. Par. 1715.

---

[1] In his work Περὶ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος (in Photius c. 75), he applies the Aristotelian definition of the relation of the individual to the genus, to the Trinity. He concedes, accordingly, only a generic unity; not a numerical unity. The three are not numerically one being, but the Godhead as the generic sum-total of the divine perfections is distributed among them. Hence there are τρεῖς μερικαὶ οῦσίαι, καὶ μία κοινή.

The emperor *Justinian*, in the very commencement of his long and externally splendid reign, came forth in honest and decided opposition to all this Monophysitism, Anti-Monophysitism, and heresy of every species, and both endeavored and hoped, by the annihilation of all heresy and the settlement of all disputes, to establish the orthodox faith upon a sure basis. And yet this very emperor, while seeking, in the exercise of an imaginary independence, to bring about entire uniformity in the church by his favorite method of imperial edicts, was himself continually influenced by his court-theologians and eunuchs, and especially by his cunning consort *Theodora*, a secret Monophysite, to adopt measures which could not but appear culpable to many sincere friends of the Chalcedon council, as well as to the church generally, although they were overruled by the hand of God for the triumph of the pure doctrine. — The emperor first appointed conferences between the Catholics and the Monophysites, but as these came to nothing he hoped by another method to bring about a union. In the year 533, the original monophysite formula, — "God (meaning one of the Trinity) was crucified," — which under Justin some Scythian monks had attempted 519–521 in vain to introduce at Constantinople and Rome, but which had found many advocates among the Catholics at the East, (hence called Θεοπασχῖται,) was declared orthodox by Justinian. In 535, by Theodora's management, *Anthimus*, a Monophysite, became patriarch of Constantinople. The visit of the Roman bishop *Agapetus* to Constantinople led to the discovery of Anthimus's Monophysitism; he was deposed in 536, and a council at Constantinople in 536 (a σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα) under the presidency of the new patriarch *Mennas* expressly condemned Monophysitism. — The controversy now, perhaps, would have slumbered, had not the revival of the *Origenistic Controversies* (§ 86) just at this time, given it a new turn, and made it the fertile source of new distractions. Among the monks in Palestine, some distinctively Origenistic tenets (the pre-existence of the human soul, etc.) had found extensive currency once more, and, under the protection of an Origenist who had obtained the emperor's favor, — *Theodorus Ascidas* bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, — these Origenistic monks, who had also adopted the Monophysite doctrine, were going through Palestine committing deeds of violence. The defenders of the Chalcedon doctrine were naturally displeased with this in the highest degree. Under the guidance of the patriarch *Mennas*, associated with the Roman arch-deacon *Pelagius*, who happened to be at Constantinople, and *Peter* patriarch of Jerusalem, they pointed out to Justinian a great number of Origenistic heresies, and in an edict, which was everywhere executed, the emperor in 541 condemned the errors of Origen, — a condemnation which was soon after reiterated by a synod at Constantinople. From revenge, and in order to divert attention from Origenism, Theodorus Ascidas now conceived the plan of working upon the emperor to bring about the condemnation of some of the most distinguished of the earlier theologians of the anti-Origenistic Antiochian school, by which means, — since the dogmatic system of these theologians had been, in part, expressly recognized as orthodox at Chalcedon, because it was opposed to Monophysitism, — he hoped to inflict a blow upon the zealous Chalcedonian opposers of the Origenists and Monophysites. Appealing to the emperor's favorite passion for bringing back the Monophysites to the Catholic church, he assured him that this object could be certainly and happily accomplished, if the Catholic church would only pass sentence of condemnation upon some of those theologians whom the Monophysites regarded as the chief promoters of Nestorianism. Accordingly the emperor, in 544, issued an edict, (which, from its specification of *τρία κεφάλαια, tria capitula*, was known under the title of the "Three Chapters,") condemning, first, the person and writings of *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, whose orthodoxy had been previously, and not without reason, suspected; secondly, those writings of

Theodoret which were aimed against Cyril, and which were, in truth, somewhat one-sided; and, thirdly, the letter of *Ibas* to Maris, in opposition to Cyril, charging him with Apollinarianism. The council of Chalcedon had asserted the general orthodoxy of Theodoret and Ibas, and hence this edict, while pronouncing the anathema upon them, and all who should defend their views, at the same time condemned all who should deduce from the imperial decision anything prejudicial to the Chalcedonian council. Many could easily see in this edict a secret favoring of Monophysitism, while on the other side it would appear as a still more accurate definition and enunciation of pure orthodoxy. Hence followed the "*Controversy of the Three Chapters*," — a little more fruitful in results, yet very distracting in its effects. The Eastern church sided with the emperor; but the Western opposed him so much the more obstinately. Justinian now sought, in particular, to obtain the voice and influence of *Vigilius* bishop of Rome, a characterless man who through the influence of Theodora and under the secret promise of declaring for the Monophysites had been elevated in 538 to the Roman see, but had not kept his agreement. Vigilius first asked the opinion of *Fulgentius Ferrandus*, an ecclesiastic of the North-African Church, which was now in a highly flourishing condition, — the result of the labors of the great Augustine in the preceding century. The judgment of Fulgentius was adverse to the condemnation of the Three Chapters. Justinian now summoned Vigilius to Constantinople (546). At first Vigilius stood firm; but at length he yielded to the influences of the court, and drew up a written condemnation (*Judicatum*) of the Three Chapters, which was to be kept private for a time. A synod was next convened at Constantinople, in 548. Here, the plan of Vigilius to obtain the support of the Western bishops for his *Judicatum* failed altogether, — chiefly through the influence of the thoroughly-educated and free-minded North-African bishop *Facundus* of Hermiane, who afterwards defended his position, and that of many of the Western bishops, in his able work *Pro defensione trium capitulorum.*[1] This made Vigilius doubtful of success. Too timid to retrace his steps openly and alone, he urged the emperor to call a general council. The emperor was willing; but seeing through the design of Vigilius, he first issued a second edict, in 551, against the Three Chapters, and demanded of Vigilius and the other bishops that they should sign it. Vigilius, emboldened by the example of the African bishops, now sought to stop the emperor in his plans, and as this was of no avail, ventured to excommunicate all defenders of the imperial edict. The emperor attempted to arrest him by an armed force, and he was obliged to flee from Constantinople to Chalcedon, where he took refuge in a church. The emperor's promise that his person should be safe brought him back again to Constantinople. Justinian now called, in 553, the *fifth oecumenical Council of Constantinople.*[2] While Vigilius was delaying, and before he took part in the deliberations, the council decided against the Three Chapters, and approved of all the imperial edicts as promotive of the pure doctrine. The edict against Origen was included, though, through the craft of Ascidas, no direct mention was made of this. Vigilius now made known his own conclusion in his *Constitutum*, in which he declared that the propositions cited from Theodore of Mopsuestia were, indeed, heretical, yet that the condemnation after their death of those who had died within the communion of the church was invalid, while the heretication of the writings of Theodoret and Ibas was a direct contradiction of the Chalcedon council. At the same time he withdrew his *Judicatum.* The emperor now caused the name of Vigilius to be erased from the church records, as that of a heretic, and imprisoned Vigilius himself. Vigilius, longing for a release from confinement, made a new declaration, in 554, in which he retracted his *Constitutum*, and accepted the decrees of the council. He died at Syracuse in 555, on his way home to Rome. His successor *Pelagius I.*

---

[1] In Gallandi Bibliotheca Patrum, T. XI.

[2] The Acta are in Mansi, T. IX. p. 157 sq.

acknowledged the fifth oecumenical council as a valid one; but a separation, for some length of time, between the Roman church and several of the Western churches was the consequence, — as the latter were with difficulty brought to recognize the fifth oecumenical council.[1] — Justinian made his last attempt to bring over the Monophysites, in the proclamation of an edict, in 564, by which the doctrine of the Aphthartodocetae, of the natural incorruptibility of the body of Christ, was declared to be orthodoxy. He had already begun to enforce it, by banishing the recusant bishops, when his death, in 565, put an end to his plans. His successor *Justin II.*, in his edict, immediately urged the Christian world to pacification. The imperial demand met with favor in every quarter, and the distracted and feeble condition of the Monophysite party rendered conformity with it more easy.

The aim in view during all this endless controversy under Justinian, — viz.: the re-union of the Monophysites with the church, — had not been attained, since the Catholics upon their side constantly insisted upon the normal authority of the council of Chalcedon. The *Monophysites*, — as the *Nestorians* had done before them, — were now formed into a *distinctive schismatical party*, which became the more isolated and determined the longer it existed, and whose separate existence was favorable to the peace of the church.[2]

This separation took place, first, in *Egypt*. Justinian, in 536, appointed a Catholic patriarch of Alexandria, but only a small portion of the Egyptians. — viz.: the descendants of Greek colonists, — received him as such. The Monophysites, — comprising the majority of the Egyptian population, the Old Egyptians, and the Copts, — chose a patriarch of their own. This was the so-called Coptic patriarch of Alexandria, whose authority was strengthened still more, in the 7th century, by the Saracens, in opposition to the Duophysites of the Roman empire.[1] From Egypt, Monophysitism spread through the entire *Abyssinian* Church. In *Armenia,* the discontent of the oppressed Monophysites probably facilitated the conquest of the country by the Persian king Chosroës (about 536), and from this time the *Armenian* Church, — having at the synod of *Thiven*, in 536, rejected the Chalcedonian doctrine, — constituted a separate Monophysite church, beneath Persian protection, and under the patriarchate of a καϑολικὸς ἐπίσκοπος. In *Syria* and *Mesopotamia*, the Monophysites were upon the verge of extinction from the lack of teachers, when the monk and presbyter *Jacob Baradaeus* (Al Baradai, because he travelled about as a beggar), or *Zanzalus*, of the cloister of Phasitla in Nisibis, having been consecrated bishop by several Monophysite bishops, re-organized their churches, and provided them with a clergy. His labors, in which he spared himself no toil or danger, extended from 541 to 578. The Monophysites of Syria and the adjacent regions took the name of *Jacobites*, from Baradaeus, and constituted a second distinct patriarchate by themselves, — that of Antioch.

---

[1] Under the commission of the North-African church, the archdeacon Liberatus composed, between 560 and 566, and as the result of several journeys, his *Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum;* extending from 428 to 533.

[2] Mich. le Quien Oriens in IV. patriarchatus digest. Par. 1740. 3 vols. fol. Assemani De Monophysitis, in Bibl. Orient. T. II.

---

[1] Taki-eddini Makrizii († 1441) Hist. Coptorum Christ. Arab. et Lat. ed. Wetzer.

Pelagian, and connected Controversies.

Original Sources: The writings of the persons engaged in these controversies cited in § 91 sq.

Compare: G. J. Vossii Hist. de controversiis quas Pelagius ejusque reliquiae moverunt, libb. VII. Lugd. 1618; auct. ed. G. Voss. Amst. 1655. Norisii Historia Pelagiana cet. Pat. 1673. Garnerii Dissert. VII. quibus integra continetur Pelagianorum historia. (in his edition of Mercator, Par. 1673). Neander Church History, II. 557—627. Wiggers Pragmatische Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus; translated by Emerson. Voigt De theoria Augustiniana, Pelagiana, Semi-Pelagiana et Synergistica. Leutzen De Pelagianorum doctrinae principiis. Jacobi Die Lehre des Pelagius. Müller Lehre von der Sunde; translated by Pulsford.

§ 91.

AUGUSTINE AND PELAGIUS.

All the controversies thus far described have been elicited by Oriental speculation, and Occidental energy has been called in to assist in their settlement. The practical spirit of the West now *originates* a controversy, not in the province of speculative Theology, but in *Anthropology.*

That man is no longer in his pure and primitive moral condition, and that the mere cultivation of his present natural powers and susceptibilities cannot possibly suffice for the attainment of the true end of his creation; that, on the contrary, his original divinely-created nature has become corrupted and ruined by the dominion within him of the principle of self-will, and that in order to live conformably with his own original constitution, and to practise holiness from a holy disposition, he needs an inward change through a divine power, — all this, in a *general* form of statement, had been the doctrine of the church from the first. It was only when still more strict definitions and statements were attempted, — and particularly when such questions as these arose: Is there in the fallen soul any power of self-restoration? if so, to what degree? and what is its relation to the renewing power of the Holy Spirit? — that the church of the first four centuries found itself not fully agreed. There was constantly a difference in this respect, between the Oriental and Occidental churches, and to some extent also within the Occidental church itself. The most distinguished theologians in the most important division of the church, viz. the Western, — such as *Tertullian* and *Cyprian* in the 3d century, *Hilary*[1] and, still more decidedly, *Ambrose*[2] in the 4th, — with a profound discernment of the true poverty and need of human nature, were chiefly concerned to make prominent the corruption of man, and the necessity of a change by divine grace. On the other hand, the Alexandrine theologians, especially *Clement*, and all those later-Oriental theologians who sympathized with the views of this school upon this point, — such as *Basil*, the *two Gregories*, *Chrysostom*, and the *Antiochians* generally, — thought it necessary to assert, and emphasize, the existence of a free power of will, still remaining in man, that is able to work before, and with, the grace of the Holy Spirit. These two doctrinal antagonisms became more and more prominent with the lapse of time, — the strictness of the one becoming still more strict, and the laxness of the other becoming still more loose, — until in the 5th century both met in direct and intense opposition in the persons of *Augustine* and *Pelagius*.

Aurelius Augustinus, born at Tagaste in Numidia, Nov. 13, 354, a man of deep and powerful nature, not the most learned yet the greatest of the fathers, and in whose energetic mind acuteness and profundity were blended in their highest degrees, after victoriously passing through the most violent inward conflicts had attained evangelical peace of conscience. Though early pointed to Christ by his excellent mother *Monica*,[3] he had become distractingly immersed in the ambitions and sensualities of earth during his residence at Carthage, — whither he had repaired for literary culture after previous studies at Tagaste and Madaura, — when, in his nineteenth year, the Hortensius of Cicero wakened a new aspiration within him after the truth. But with all his newly awakened longing after a higher life, the power to *realize* his aspiration was ever wanting. As a teacher of rhetoric at Carthage (from 376), and afterwards at Rome, and finally at Milan (from 384), he was continually wavering between the world and God, — in a constant conflict between his ambition and lusts on the one side, and the unmistakable remorse and aspirings of his soul, and the prayers and tears of his mother,[1] on the other. For nine years he sought for the truth among the Manichaeans, who did not demand or insist upon faith, but talked much of a higher cognition of the reason, and who by employing apparently Christian phraseology seemed to join on upon the ineradicable impressions and instructions of his childhood. Seeing himself deceived, he began to fall into scepticism, and was again speculatively re-established by the Platonic philosophy. But he could not find in this human system the two things he was seeking for, — viz.: *peace with conscience and with God*, and the *renovating power* requisite to a holy life. Through various remarkable providences, and stormy conflicts both of the outer and the inner life, he was at length, in the year 386, at Milan, brought to a believing reception of the gospel in its purity and simplicity, — a crisis for which the preparation had long been going on in his soul, and which was accelerated by the startling impression made upon him by the passage in Romans xiii. 13, 14, to which he had casually opened on seeming to hear from on high, in a moment of deep spiritual despondency and distress, the words: "Tolle, lege." He received baptism, together with his son Adeodatus[2] a youth of fifteen, on Easter-Sunday 387, from bishop Ambrose, to whose spiritual instructions he was greatly indebted for his new experience.

---

[1] Comm. in Matth. c. 18, § 6; in Ps. 118, c. 20; in Ps. 51, c. 32; in Matth. c. 16, § 8; De Trinitate II. 35; VIII. 12.

[2] Comm. in Ps. 48, c. 9; Apolog. Davidis II. 61; Comm. in Ps. 48, c. 47; De interpellatione David IV.; Sermo 13, in Ps. 112; In Lucam VII. c. 27; De fide V. 83.

[3] Goetze Dissertatio de Monica.

---

[1] She did not die till 388, — having lived to see the conversion of her son, and dying tenderly lamented by him.

[2] He was a natural son, and had grown up without the blessing of a domestic training. The heart of his father, which after conversion clung so much the more tenderly to him, was deeply smitten by his early death.

From this time onward, he drew without ceasing from the fountain of light and peace which welled up within, and there followed that new and ever expanding life of consecration to God, of Christian knowledge and holiness, which has made him a teacher for all succeeding centuries. — Augustine gave up the function of a rhetorician, which had in various ways ministered to his vanity, and in 388 returned to Africa, where, though feeling himself to be unfit for the office, he was made presbyter in 391, and in 395, (at the pressing request of the aged bishop Valerius, and in ignorance of the church statute forbidding it,[1]) co-bishop, and then, probably in 396, sole bishop of Hippo Regius (Bona) in Numidia. Here he labored not merely for his own particular charge, but also, — by training up capable teachers and clergymen, and in all other ways,— for the entire North-African church, which he led and guided by the power of his intellect with manifest blessing. In the last part of his life he was compelled to see great suffering befall his church and native-land from the Vandals,[2] and finally died, August 28th, 430, in a city which had already been closely besieged three months by them, — spending the last ten days of his life absorbed in meditation and prayer.[3]

---

[1] His regret afterwards at this irregularity, of which this was not the first instance in the history of the church however, led to the decision of the Council of Carthage in 397, that those who were to be ordained as presbyters and bishops should previously be made acquainted with the statutes and rules of the church.

[2] These outward storms in the last days of Augustine's life, resulting from the irruption of the Vandals, were the more distressing to him since they were occasioned by one of his own earlier friends, — the distinguished Roman general *Boniface.* In the year 418, Boniface had formed an intimate acquaintance with Augustine by correspondence, but afterwards led a worldly life as Commissioner (Comes) of Africa, and finally, getting into difficulty with the imperial court, rebelled against the government. At first, he was victorious, and Augustine about 428 addressed him a letter of advice and warning, but afterwards being hard pressed he called the Vandals to his assistance in 429. These barbarians were too well pleased with Africa to be willing to retire at Boniface's request. Boniface himself was at length closely besieged by them in Hippo, and in the third month of the siege Augustine died there.

[3] Augustine's *Writings* (Comp. Busch Librorum Aug. recensus) are partly philosophical, partly theological. His Philosophical works are the result of actual conversations, and hence are composed in the form of dialogue, and belong to the earliest part of his literary life, — viz.: A.D. 386—388. They are the following: *Libri III. Contra Academicos* (maintaining that man can arrive not

As Augustine had been led by the course which his entire religious experience had taken, to adopt the fundamental principle of his *Theology* (§ 81), — viz.: that no man by mere dialectics and speculation can attain to a right understanding

---

merely at the probable, but at the truth itself); *Libri II, de ordine* (upon the good and evil in the divine arrangement of the world); *Soliloquia* (respecting the investigation of supersensuous truth, and the immortality of the soul); *De magistro* (a dialogue with his son respecting the word of God): *De musica*, and others.

The Theological writings of Augustine, — a rich treasure for the intellectual and spiritual life of the individual Christian, and, at the same time, furnishing a vivid picture of the general life of the church of that day, — fall into seven principal classes: 1. Apologetical (of which, the chief is *De civitate Dei libb. XXII.*, the great apologetic work of the Ancient church, composed in the years 413—426. See § 64); 2. Dogmatical (dogmatic-catechetical, strictly dogmatic, dogmatic-ethical, dogmatic-exegetical); 3. Polemical; 4. Exegetical; 5. Ascetical; 6. Homiletical (Sermones); 7. Writings relating to his own life and experience. — To the last belong: the rich collection of his *Letters;* the *Confessionum libb. XIII.* written in 388, containing a minute and supplicatory delineation of his life up to that time, — the tenth book being an examination of the state of his renewed heart, and the last three not relating to himself, but giving his view of the account of the creation in Genesis; the *Retractationum libb. II.*, composed in 427, and containing a critical examination of all his own writings, and a specification of what he held to be erroneous in them. — To his *Ascetical Writings* belong: the *Meditationes; De agone Christi*, written in 396; the *Speculum*, written in 428; and others. — Augustine's *Exegetical Works* are characterized by a profound penetration into the spirit of the sacred writers, which, however, would often have been applied with more pertinence and good sense, had it been guided by the grammatical and historical knowledge of an Origen or Jerome. They relate to Genesis (*De Genesi ad literam libb. XII.*), the Psalms (*Ennarrationes*), Matthew (*XVII Quaestiones*), Romans and Galatians (*Expositiones*), and John's Gospel (124 *Tractatus*); to these may be added *De sermone Domini in monte libb. II* (ethical discussions written in 393), *De consensu evangelistarum libb. IV.* (a reply to pagan attacks), *Quaestiones evangelicae* (relating to Matthew and Luke, and composed in 400), and others. — Augustine's numerous *Polemical Writings* are aimed principally against the Manichaeans, the Donatists, the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians. Against the *Manichaeans*, are the following: *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum libb. II.* (written in 388); *De libero arbitrio libb. II.* (the first book of early origin); *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, and *De utilitate credendi* (both composed early, in 389 and 391); *Contra Adimantum* (written in 394, in opposition to the assumption of an irreconcilable contradiction between the Old and New Testaments); *Contra Faustum libri XXXIII.* (composed about 404, and contains in quotations the greater part of Faustus's work); *Contra Secundinum* (written in 405); and others. In opposition to the *Donatists* are the following: *Contra literas Petiliani* (a defence of the Catholic church and its doctrines and sacraments in opposition to the pastoral letters of the Donatist bishop Petilianus, — written about 400); *De baptismo libri VII.* (asserting the validity of baptism by heretics); *Contra Cresconium* (written about 406, defending the employment of logic and of divine things, but that this proceeds from a moral change within the soul, since it is only when the human reason has by faith entered into communion with God that it is capable

dialectics, in opposition to the Donatist grammarian Cresconius); *Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis* (a brief of the discussions in the conference held with the Donatists in 412, who complained of unjust treatment); *Contra Gaudientium* (composed about 420, in defence of the "coge intrare" (Luke xiv. 23), and maintaining that suicide, even when committed from religious considerations, should be punished by the church, — in opposition to the Donatist bishop Gaudentius); and others. The writings of Augustine against the *Pelagians* and *Semi-Pelagians* are mentioned below, among his dogmatic works. Augustine also wrote against the Arians, in 418 and 428; against the Priscillians, in 415; against a Marcionite teacher, in 420 (*Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum*); and against heresy in the abstract, in 429 (*De haeresibus*). — Among the numberless *Dogmatical Writings* of Augustine the following are the most noteworthy: the contra-Manichaean treatise *De vera religione* (written about 390, and taking the position that the ground of all error in the search for true religion is the desire "intelligere carnalia et videre spiritalia;" "tolle vanitantes, et nulla erit vanitas"); *De fide et symbolo* (an address delivered before the council of Hippo 393); *De mendacio* (composed about 393, against the doctrine of "accommodatio" and "fraus pia"); *Contra mendacium* (written about 420, in opposition to the Priscillianist tenets respecting deception); *De diversis quaestionibus* (exegetical and dogmatical); *Ad Simplicianum* (Ambrose's successor at Milan) *libri II.* (written about 397 or 398); *De octoginta tribus quaestionibus* (composed about 398, upon philosophical, dogmatical, and exegetical problems upon which he had previously held oral discourse); *De doctrina Christiana libri IV.* (a hermeneutical-dogmatic compendium for religious teachers, — a guide to the deduction of the pure doctrine from the Bible, and its terse and effective statement for the popular mind, — the first three books were written in 397, the fourth in 426); *De catechizandis rudibus* (upon the best mode of teaching catechumens, — written about 400); *De bono conjugali* (elicited by Jovinian, and aiming at a just estimate of marriage as well as of celibacy); *De fide et operibus* (written about 413, against a dead and formal faith); the *Enchiridion* sc. *de fide, spe, et caritate* (a manual of Christian doctrine); *De Trinitate libri XV.* (written 400—416, as a defence, and a speculative dialectic investigation, of the doctrine); the Anti-Pelagian writings, *Contra Pelagium et Coelestium libri II., De peccatorum meritis et remissione libri III.* (written in 412), *De spiritu et litera* (in 413, upon law and grace), *De natura et gratia* (415), *De gratia Dei et de peccato originali* (418), *De gestis Pelagii* (416), several writings *Contra Julianum;* and, lastly, the works in defence of Augustine's doctrine of Predestination, *De gratia et libero arbitrio* (427), *De correptione et gratia* (427), *De praedestinatione sanctorum* (428), *De dono perseverantiae* (429), and others.

Opera edid. Monachi Benedictini e Congr. Sanct. Mauri (principally Blancpain and Constant) Par. 1679—1700. 11 Volumes folio; also Antwerp 1700 12 Volumes folio; and Venice 1729. 12 Volumes folio. The latest edition is that in Caillau and Guillon's Collectio selecta eccles. Patrum T. 108—148. Par. 1839 sq. — Respecting Augustine himself, see the Vita Augustini by his pupil, the bishop Possidius or Posidonius of Colama in Numidia (in the Opera);

of a true knowledge of God (fides praecedit intellectum),[1] — so, in like manner, the definiteness, clearness, and depth of his *Anthropology* were the product and result of an inward conflict, an inward victory, and an inward life. That man, as he now is after and by reason of Adam's sin, cannot of and by himself attain to holiness, but is enslaved in a state of moral corruption, and needs an entire change by the power of the Holy Spirit, in order to attain the true end of his creation and live in accordance with the requirements of his original nature, — of all this, Augustine was the more thoroughly convinced, because he had vividly experienced it in his own personal history, and because by his inward conflicts he had been led to a more diligent study and a fuller understanding of the Scriptures, especially the writings of Paul. On the one side, the doctrine of the native corruption of man (peccatum originale), the source of all particular transgressions, and on the other, the doctrine of the regenerating influences of God upon the corrupt nature of man, whereby the otherwise lost human soul is made the recipient of a new and ever-expanding divine life,[2] — these two doctrines combined were the organizing and animating idea of the Augustinian system. In the *first and briefer* period in his Christian life, when he was fresh from the influence of the Manichaean theory of the *necessitated origin* of moral

---

Bindemann Der heilige Augustinus; Böhringer Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen. Th. I. Abth. 3; Poujoulet Histoire de Sainte Augustine (Catholic); Eisenbarth Der heilige Augustinus (Catholic); Kloth Der heilige Kirchenlehrer Augustinus (Catholic); Gangauf Psychologie des Augustinus (Catholic).

[1] This ground-truth was very fertile of results, in its influence upon the thinking of Augustine. It led him to assert the self-subsistence of faith, and its independence of speculation; the rationality of the idea of a revelation; and that the Christian dogmatical system must be a pure and simple development of *revelation* from within outwards, and not an aggregation or importation from the various branches of human science and knowledge. In this last reference, Augustine was the first to found a scientific system of Christian dogmatics, in contradistinction from all merely philosophical systems, — even that of Plato, which the New Platonists were seeking to substitute for the Christian system.

[2] Baptism alone is not sufficient, "peccatum per baptismum praeterit reatu, manet actu;" there must be added the "interna atque occulta, mirabilis ac ineffabilis potestas operans in cordibus."

evil, it seemed to him to be important to attribute to the self-determination of man some co-operating efficiency towards his own regeneration. His general view, in this regard,—which he exhibited, more particularly, in the works *De libero arbitrio* and *De vera religione*, — was the following: After apostasy it is no longer within the competence of man to be holy, because he lacks knowledge, and because he lacks power. The pure spiritual knowledge of goodness, and the pure spiritual power to practise it, possessed by and at creation, human nature (since the consequences of the first sin are propagated to every individual) has lost, as a just punishment of the primitive voluntary act of apostasy, and now nothing but the grace of God can save man. But the divine love will impart this grace to every individual provided he will do his part. This (now natural) "ignorantia" and "difficultas boni" is a *disease* of the moral nature, and is not imputed to man as properly sinful and culpable. Man's guilt consists in not striving after knowledge and holiness, and in not accepting the offered means of salvation; for, — as Augustine teaches, somewhat later, in the *Explicatio propositionum quarundarum ex epistola ad Romanos*, — it depends upon the will of each individual whether he will, by faith, make himself susceptible to and receptive of the influences of the Holy Spirit, or whether he will repel and exclude them by unbelief; and the divine predestination is conditioned upon the foreknowledge of faith or of unbelief in each individual instance. But this point soon became the turning-point in Augustine's mode of thinking, as is apparent from the *Quaestiones ad Simplicianum* written about the year 398 (Lib. I. qu. 2).[1] A new statement was now formed, in the *second and longer period* in his Christian life, which remained the permanent one, becoming more definitive and firm with the lapse of years, and obtaining a clear and powerful enunciation in the Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian controversies.—Augustine had hitherto regarded faith as the product of the human will, and thereby had not entirely excluded all self-efficient meritoriousness of man in the work of regeneration. But in proportion as his knowledge of himself, and of the moral corruption common to all mankind, became more profound, and he knew more clearly from his own experience that the very first and faintest beginnings of faith itself are the work of the Holy Ghost, — since faith is in its own nature a spiritual and holy act, and is, moreover, the germinal starting-point for the whole subsequent development of grace within the renewed soul, — so much the more decidedly must he reject his earlier synergistic view of regeneration. He saw no middle ground between synergism and monergism, and now gave expression to the position that, if faith itself is the gift of God and a divine product within the soul, and man in his state of *total* moral aversion and enmity towards God and goodness is unable to co-operate with the Holy Spirit in the regenerating act, — since co-operation implies some (however slight) *sameness* of inclination, and affection, instead of entire aversion and hostility, — then regeneration depends, ultimately, upon the sovereign will and compassion of God, and his almighty, irresistible, and overcoming influence upon and in the otherwise resisting human soul.[1] Thus, the Augustinian system with rigorous self-consistence formed itself as follows: All men before regeneration, and since Adam's fall (which corrupted human nature both physically and morally), are in essentially one and the same state of alienation from God, of spiritual enmity towards Him, and of condemnation by Him. This state is one of self-will without the power to the contrary,[2] and hence fallen man, *as such*, can do nothing but evil. He can be delivered from this state only by the grace of God, who imparts the principle of holiness and progressive sanctification through the medium of faith in Christ. This grace (as gratia irresistibilis), with internal and almighty power overcomes the utmost intensity of man's self-will and aversion, and the recipient of it is eternally saved. But not all are recipients of grace in this its efficient and highest form and grade. Out of the entire human race, which as a sum-total is guilty and righteously condemned (massa perditionis), God predestinates and elects a portion in Christ to eternal life, and *realizes* his decree by imparting his grace in its three successive forms of *gratia praeveniens*, *gratia operans*, and

---

[1] Compare De praedestinatione sanctorum c. 4.

---

[1] "Deus ita suadet, ut persuadeat." "Voluntati Dei, qui etiam illa, quae futura sunt, fecit, humanae voluntates non possunt resistere, quominus faciat ipse quod vult." — De correptione et gratia c. 14. Irresistible grace, according to Augustine, does not destroy human freedom, because it does not operate *externally* upon the will, and consequently exerts no compulsory power upon this faculty. On the contrary, it preserves even the "formal" freedom of the voluntary faculty, because it operates by an altogether *inward* efficiency, thereby working in it "*to will*" (Philip. ii. 13); while at the same time, it secures the "real" or higher freedom of the voluntary faculty, which consists, according to Augustine, in the synthesis of will and reason, or the harmony and oneness of the human with the divine will.

[2] According to the Augustinian idea of moral freedom, the highest form of free

---

will is not endangered by the power to the contrary, or the "possibilitas peccandi." The infinite intensity with which the Infinite Will is one with the Infinite Reason, together with the untemptability of the Supreme Being (ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἀπείραστός ἐστι, James i. 13), renders apostasy within the sphere of the Infinite both impossible and logically inconceivable. This is *absolute* moral perfection, — viz.: self-determined holiness without the possibility of sinning. The finite will, on the other hand, is created in a probationary state, and, consequently, with only a *relative* moral perfection, — viz.: positive and total holiness with a power to the contrary, or the possibility of apostasy. This latter power, however, is only an accident and not the substance of moral freedom, — the substance itself being *self*-decision, *self*-determination, simply. Hence, the power to the contrary is, by the very idea of the will, intended to disappear, as soon as the period of probation in the history of a finite spirit is passed. It may disappear in either one of two directions. If the power to apostatize is not used, and the finite will continues in the state of relative moral perfection in which it was created, it then passes into a state of established holiness, or absolute moral perfection, like that of God, in which there is no longer the power to the contrary and the hazard of apostasy. The angels who "kept their first estate" have safely passed this ordeal, and this accident of a "formal" freedom, temporarily attached to the will for purposes of probation, has been lost in the substantial or "real" freedom of a rational spirit. The fallen angels and man, on the contrary, have used this accidental and incidental power to the contrary, while in their probationary condition, and have fallen from their primitive state of relative moral perfection into the state of positive and total sinfulness. Probation is now over, since they are no longer on trial to see if they will keep their first estate. They have now passed into the state of established and (per se) eternal sinfulness, in which the power to the contrary disappears in the other direction, and self-recovery becomes as impossible in this state as self-ruin is in the sphere of God and the holy angels. The position that the substance of moral agency is *self*-decision, or *self*-determination, and that the power to the contrary is only the temporary, probationary accident, is vital to a right understanding of the Augustinian theory of sin and grace. — *Translator.*

gratia co-operans,[1] whereby the elect are convicted of sin, empowered to the act of faith, and sustained in the Christian race and fight. The remainder of mankind are simply *left* and *surrendered* to their already existing self-decision and the eternal condemnation which it deserves. And the ground why grace in its full and irresistible form is imparted to some men and not to others, does not lie in any greater natural recipiency or susceptibility towards the operations of grace on the part of some than of others, — since, aside from the influences of grace, all men are *equally* because *entirely* hostile to holiness, — but in the eternal, unconditional, and secret decree of the Divine Mind (decretum absolutum).

To the personal character and doctrinal system of Augustine, a most direct and total contrast appeared in the British monk *Pelagius* (Morgan), — a man of no inconsiderable philological learning,[2] but not of a profound mind or heart, devoid of a rich inward Christian experience, not feeling as did Augustine the weight and pressure of the deeper problems relating to man's origin and destiny, and whose ascetic ethics led him to misconceive the true spiritual nature of Christian holiness and sanctification, — a superficial, honest monk who had no experience or intimation of deep inward soul-conflicts, and whose most serious religious teaching never went beyond the exhortation to live a sober and virtuous life. Not enlightened by the high celestial ideal of truth and holiness, which would have revealed to him the contrariety between these and his own fallen nature, and by reason of a cold temperament not specially inclined to overt acts of vice, Pelagius had lived a quiet and passionless life of study in his cloister, without being tossed by the storms of either an outward or an inward experience; and now when he fell in with men who made use of the doctrine of human corruption and free grace to excuse their own sins, he supposed nothing more salutary could be done than to preach a rigorous morality to them,[1] represent that their nature was by no means corrupted by the sin of Adam, but was still in its original created condition,[2] and that it depended entirely upon the will of each individual whether he should elicit his latent moral force, and cultivate his moral faculties, and so attain to eternal happiness, — a doctrine which drives every man of earnest and profound nature to despair, so soon as he discovers that his inward life does not correspond to the ideal of character delineated by the perfect law of God, and that his most strenuous efforts to bring his whole soul into conformity with this ideal are an entire failure; while, on the other hand, it inevitably leads the shallow and less thoughtful man, who supposes that he can reach the true end of his existence by an external legality without inward holiness, to pharisaical hypocrisy and formalism. In this way, Pelagius had thrown out of the Christian system not only the doctrines of irresistible grace and absolute predestination,[1] which would appear to him as the most extreme perversion of truth, but also the plainest fundamental doctrines of the gospel, — the corruption of human nature, the internal sanctifying influences of divine grace, the kindred doctrine of regeneration by the Holy Ghost, and, thus, the general distinction between nature and grace. The doctrine of Redemption also, by this method, lost its true meaning and worth, although the term was still retained, and the entire system of revealed religion was unconsciously but thoroughly transmuted into sheer and mere Naturalism.[2]

---

[1] The law, — which is incapable of slaying sin within man, until through faith the spirit of law has been implanted within him (Aug. De spiritu et litera), — brings man to the knowledge of sin, and impels him to seek the help of God. But this first stirring and impulse itself is an effect of grace, gratia praeveniens (praevenit ut vocemur," — Aug. De natura et gratia, c. 35). Thus man attains to faith in the gospel *promise* of mercy; through faith he now receives the grace which heals the soul of sin, restores its spiritual soundness, and thereby its true freedom. This is gratia operans. But man after this regeneration still needs supporting and assisting grace, gratia co-operans, whose efficiency continues to the end of this life, thereby imparting the donum perseverantiae which is the sign and seal of the elect. The last form of grace is that by which the redeemed soul is endowed with an absolute, and not merely relative perfection in the heavenly state, — of which the characteristic is the non posse peccare.

[2] This is proved by his *Writings*. His principal work is a commentary upon the Pauline Epistles, *Expositiones in epistolas Pauli* (Hebrews excepted), which, somewhat altered, has come down in the recasting of it by Cassiodorus preserved among the works of Jerome. Besides this, there is extant Pelagius's ascetic *Epistola ad Demetriadem*, and considerable fragments of his *Libellus fidei* addressed to Innocent I, (both also among the Works of Jerome.) and the fragments of his two works *De natura* and *De libero arbitrio*, together with an *Epistola ad Innocentium*, which are preserved in the works of Augustine.

---

[1] "Omne bonum ac malum non nobiscum oritur, sed *agitur* a nobis" — Pelagius De libero arbitrio.

[2] This, according to Pelagius, was an indifferent, and characterless middle-position between good and evil ("Capaces enim utriusque rei, non pleni nascimur; sine virtute et vitio procreamur." — De lib. arbitrio. "Liberum est, unum semper ex duobus agere, quum semper utrumque possimus." — Ad Demetr. c. 8). This uncommitted state of indifference, Pelagius denominated freedom. But Augustine denied the possibility of such a state within the sphere of human existence. The idea of a human spirit, he contended, necessarily implies positive character, either good or evil; man before all *manifestation* of activity is already inwardly determined either for God or for self, and the moral bent and bias of his spirit is one of communion with God or else of alienation from him.

---

[1] "Quisque . . . sua sponte et suo arbitrio credit." — Pelagius ad 1 Cor. i. 1. "Quos praescivit (Deus) credituros, hos vocavit; vocatio autem volentes collegit, non invitos." — Ad Rom. ix. 30.

[2] The proper centre-point from which the opposition between the Augustinian and Pelagian systems starts, is the theory of the relation of the finite to the infinite Spirit. *Augustine* proceeds from the position that as God is the self-subsistent arch-source of all existence, so He is of all goodness and truth; and that created spirits cannot possess the Good and the True as independent and self-subsistent qualities of their nature, but they participate in them only by communion with God, and in dependence upon Him. Every attempt, consequently, of a created spirit to be or do something for itself, without and apart from God, is the first germ and cause of moral evil. As the eye is not the light itself, but merely has the capacity of receiving light from the sun, such also is the soul in relation to God. This brings Augustine to the distinction between the life of communion with God, and that false life of alienation which is severed from God, and left to itself. This is the great distinction between "gratia" and "natura," running through all modes of created rational existence; for even in man's unfallen condition, and in that of the holy angels, "gratia" is the source of all goodness, — only in these instances it is sustaining and confirming grace, instead of renewing and sanctifying grace. *Pelagius*, on the contrary, regards the finite spirit as a complete, self-included, and independent unit; the individual man is endowed with all necessary powers and faculties, and he only needs to draw upon *them* in order to a true and perfect self-development. Among these faculties, which are unalterable, and necessarily retain their concreated qualities and traits, is the moral power of free will. For the attainment of the high and ideal dignity of human nature, nothing is essentially requisite but a development of the will. Consequently, there could be no place for the distinction between nature and grace, in the Pelagian system. — According to Pelagius, no great catastrophe like the apostasy and ruin of the human spirit can occur. Man must ever stand in one and the same position in reference to right and wrong, — equally able to choose either, for the "possibilitas utriusque partis" is the very essence and definition of moral freedom, and cannot be alienated or lost. To this, Augustine objects that then God

§ 92.

THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.

The contest between Augustine and Pelagius had scarcely broken out, when it came to an end, — so distinctly did the Christian consciousness of the Western church set itself against the shallow heresy, and so manlike and dispassionate was the dialectic opposition to it.

During his residence at Rome, from 409 to 411, *Pelagius* disseminated his doctrines orally and through his Commentary on the Pauline Epistles. In company with his friend or pupil the monk *Coelestius*,[1] who had once been an advocate at Rome, he went to Carthage in 411, where Coelestius very unwisely for himself became a candidate for the office

---

and the holy angels are not free. Pelagius asserts that the sin of Adam in the garden was the slightest of all, being like the disobedience of an inexperienced child. Augustine, on the contrary, regards it as an act indicative of a deep central estrangement of will from God, which inward spiritual estrangement has disturbed the entire harmony of man's moral nature, and passes on through every individual of the race. Pelagius denied that any physical or moral corruption of human nature resulted from the Adamic transgression, and interpreted the statements of Romans v. as teaching the power of bad example and the force of imitation, — asserting, moreover, that sin is not strictly universal, but that some have lived without transgression. In reference to this doctrine of "imitatio," Augustine asks why it is that a bad example has such wide-spread and powerful influence over an unweakened and unenslaved will. With such views of the actual condition of human nature, it is evident that the doctrine of Redemption, which Pelagius continued to hold nominally, must lose its whole true meaning and value. — That the system of Pelagius was substantially that of natural religion merely, is proved by his reference to the virtues of the better pagans, in support of his tenet of the possibility of man's living without transgression, and by his denial of a difference in kind between pagan and Christian virtue. Augustine, in opposition to this position, asserted that the virtues cannot be thus contemplated in isolation from the animating principle of the whole moral man; that the "intentio" is the "oculus animi;" that every thing depends upon the disposition, and that that which does not proceed from a believing and holy disposition is not truly moral or virtuous, however much it may shine and dazzle, but is merely a "splendidum peccatum."

[1] Some of his *Definitiones* are still extant, scattered here and there in the works of Augustine.

of presbyter. The charge of holding erroneous doctrine was brought against Coelestius by *Paulinus* a deacon of Milan, and he was summoned to defend himself before the synod of Carthage, in 412, under the presidency of bishop *Aurelius* (392—430). This synod gave the first ecclesiastical decision respecting Pelagianism. The discussion related more particularly to the two principal positions of Coelestius, that the sin of Adam had injured only himself and not all mankind, and that infants are born into the world in the same condition that Adam was before the fall, — in reality, therefore, to the question whether human nature since Adam's apostasy is corrupt or not. Coelestius endeavored to make it appear, that the whole dispute was one about unessential and merely speculative points; but his evasions and explanations were altogether unsatisfactory, and as he refused to retract the two above-mentioned positions, and six deductions which the council drew from them, he was excommunicated. *Pelagius* himself had meanwhile gone to Palestine as early as 411; and the attempt was made to transfer the controversy to the East, and decide it within that portion of the church whose anthropological opinions were least definite and clear. The Eastern church still held the earlier and less definitely-stated type of doctrine respecting human apostasy and corruption which had prevailed in the 2d and 3d centuries, — a type of anthropology which, indeed, in its general substance and whole intent was contrary to the Pelagian, but which, unlike that of Augustine and the Western Latin fathers who preceded him, did not, by profound, exact, and thorough analyses and definitions, preclude the possibility of Pelagian modifications and deductions. When, consequently, Pelagius appeared in the East, professing in general terms his belief in the doctrine of grace and redemption, — by which he meant only an external arrangement and economy of God, whereby the human mind is enlightened by the perfect morality taught in the Scriptures, and is stimulated and aided by precept and example to the practice of virtue, — the Oriental mind was easily induced to accept the statement as sufficient, and the more so because of its aversion to all close and perplexing investigation of the doctrine of original sin. Pelagius was accused of holding heretical doctrine, in 415, before a synod at *Jerusalem* under the presidency of bishop *John* of Jerusalem, by the Spanish presbyter *Paulus Orosius*, a friend and admirer of Augustine, who was then visiting Jerome at Bethlehem (Comp. § 64, 2)[1]; and also, in the same year, before another and larger synod at *Diospolis* under the presidency of the metropolitan *Eulogius* of Caesarea, by two Western bishops then living in the East, *Heros* of Arles, and *Lazarus* of Aqua (Aix). At the first council, he succeeded in satisfying his judges by the explanation, that in asserting that man could live without sin if he only would, he spoke of man after his conversion, and that he did not deny the influence of grace upon the converted man, or intend to teach that any man had actually lived free from sin.[2] At Diospolis, he succeeded in disentangling himself from the twelve or fourteen charges brought against him, by avoiding a definition of what he meant by grace, and by ambiguities from which the Eastern bishops did not probe out the real intent and meaning. But the more that Pelagius and his friends boasted of this success, so much the more zealously did the Western church, and especially that of North-Africa with Augustine for its leader,[3] enter into a thorough examination of the Pelagian error; and Augustine, in the year 416, in his work *De gestis Pelagii*, showed without any reservation that the Orientals had been deceived by the declarations of Pelagius. At the synods of *Mileve* and *Carthage*, both held in 416, the African bishops solemnly condemned Pelagianism, and in two letters, — to which five African bishops, one of whom was Augustine, added a third, — invited the concurrence of *Innocent I.*

---

[1] There is still extant, from him, an *Apologeticus contra Pelagium.* Opera P. Orosii ed. Havercamp. Lugd. 1738.

[2] Yet he had, certainly in several places in his writings (Com. Rom. v. 12, and De libero Arbitrio, as quoted in Augustine De natura et gratia § 42), distinctly made this last statement, and mentioned the names of those who had so lived.

[3] The Western theologian *Jerome* also wrote against the Pelagians (Dialogi contra Pelagianos, libri III.), but with far more personal feeling, and far less acuteness and profundity than Augustine.

of Rome (402—416), to whom, at Orosius's suggestion, the council of Jerusalem had communicated its doings, since Pelagius was from the West. Innocent readily concurred with the North-African decision. The North-Africans had charged Pelagius, together with Coelestius, with not really maintaining the doctrine of *true* free will itself, inasmuch as he denied the true Christian doctrine of grace which alone sets the will free, — making "grace" to mean merely the natural powers of man given to him in creation, together with the revelation of a moral law, and the other ordinary provisions of the Creator for man's moral welfare. Hence Pelagius and Coelestius, the latter making a journey for this purpose to Rome, sought to justify themselves before the Roman bishop. Innocent had been succeeded by *Zosimus* (417—418), a man without deep Christian knowledge, without firm character, without scientific insight, and perhaps, also, originally from the East. Zosimus expressed himself satisfied with Pelagius's written, and Coelestius's oral statements and explanations, — in which much was said about "grace," while at the same time Coelestius, with a shrewd humility, submitted the entire decision of the case to the judgment of the Roman see, — and sent two letters to the Africans rebuking their propensity for hair-splitting speculations, and declaring Pelagius and Coelestius to be orthodox, unless new charges should be brought against them within two months. The African bishops now met again in council at *Carthage*, in 417, and set forth in the most plain and distinct terms that they could not be satisfied with the explanations of Pelagius and Coelestius, and why they could not be. Zosimus now began to waver, and promised to re-investigate the matter; but, without waiting for him, a *general synod at Carthage*, in 418, laid down in opposition to Pelagianism nine definite and firm *Canones*, which the emperor *Honorius* himself soon after followed up with a *Sacrum rescriptum* against the Pelagians. Zosimus now wished to put Coelestius upon examination again; but Coelestius took flight from Rome, and the *Epistola tractoria*, — a circular-letter of Zosimus, of the year 418, in which he acquiesces in the sentence of condemnation passed by the African bishops both upon the doctrines and the persons of Pelagius and Coelestius, and which he sent around to the whole Western church to be subscribed to, — soon put an end to the controversy, so far as its formal and outward aspects were concerned. Eighteen Italian bishops who refused to subscribe, among whom was the acute bishop *Julian*[1] of Eclanum in Apulia, who steadfastly continued to defend his views, were deposed from their offices.[2]

Thus, since the doctrine and experience of the Universal Church was in distinct opposition to Pelagianism, had the Augustinian system triumphed speedily and without difficulty in the Western church over the Pelagian; and, through the succeeding Semi-Pelagian controversy, it became still more authoritative and dominant, at least in theory, within this portion of Christendom. And even in the Eastern church, where *Marius Mercator*,[3] in particular, a native Oriental and friend of Augustine, made though a lay-man a powerful opposition to the Pelagian scheme, the oecumenical *council of Ephesus*, in 431, condemned Pelagianism. Yet the strict Occidental-Augustinian system did not obtain actual prevalence and sway in the East, either at this time, or afterwards; although the Oriental theologians ever kept up a decided opposition to Pelagianism, but an opposition that was inconsequent from the position which they occupied, as may be seen by reference to the anthropological views of *Isidore of Pelusium*,[1] and still more of *Theodore of Mopsuestia*.[2]

---

[1] Of his writings (*Libri IV. ad Turbantium, Libri VIII. ad Florum*), important fragments are extant in Augustine's work *Contra Julianum*, and in his *Opus imperfectum* against this ablest defender of Pelagianism.

[2] Most of them took refuge at Constantinople, where Nestorius received them. Several of them afterwards expressed regret for their course, and were restored to their former clerical positions. Shoots of the Pelagian party continued to spring up in Italy down to 450, and even as late as about 500 an aged bishop *Seneca* stood upon a distinctly Pelagian position. For this reason, the Roman bishop *Leo the Great* revived the earlier ordinances respecting Pelagianizing clergymen, and their re-admission to church communion only after the most careful examination.

[3] There are extant of his writings, a *Commonitorium adversus haeresin Pelagii et Coelestii* (presented to Theodosius II. in 429, translated into Latin in 431); and a *Commonitorium super nomine Coelestii*. Opera ed. Garnerius. Par. 1673; also Baluzius. Par. 1684; also in Gallandus T. VIII. 613.

---

[1] Isidore of Pelusium, one of the most thoughtful representatives of the Oriental mode of thinking, stands perhaps mid-way between Augustine and Pelagius. According to him, the consequence of Adam's sin was such a corruption of his nature as subjected it to mortality, and strong sensuous incitements to sin, — which corruption growing worse by neglect has passed upon all men by propagation (Epistolae III. 205, 162; IV. 204). Yet there still remains a seed of goodness in human nature (Epist. II. 2), which however is not efficient and operative without the assistance of prevenient, but not irresistible, grace (Epist. III. 171). An absolute predestination, he contends, is incompatible with the reward promised to those who are victorious in the Christian conflict (Epist. III. 165).

[2] According to him, God has projected the whole course of the universe according to a connected plan, and its accomplishment cannot be prevented by any occurrence like the sin of man. The disobedience of the first man was the work of his own free will which God foresaw and permitted, because it would serve the salutary purpose of bringing man to a consciousness of his own weakness. The apostasy was, consequently, a part of God's plan of the universe, in the following manner. God has constituted the whole created universe in two parts or sections, — first, *mere* and *pure* Nature, left to itself, and subject to transiency and change; and second, this same Nature, *elevated* above itself, and *ennobled* in communion with God, through the inworking and indwelling of a principle of divine life proceeding from Him. With the first section, which is Creation proper, the second section, or Redemption, is necessarily supposed and connected in the total plan. But the passage from the first to the second must be brought about by a conflict; man must learn to know both good and evil, before the first "mere" Nature in him can be elevated into the second glorified or "redeemed" Nature. Theodore, then, harmonized entirely with Pelagius, in asserting the primitive weakness and imperfection of human nature, in denying original sin as the consequence of the first sin, in asserting a necessarily perpetual power of choosing either good or evil, and in opposing the doctrine of predestination; but there was this difference between them, in that the scheme of Pelagius afforded not even a point of contact for the doctrine of Redemption, while in that of Theodore it constituted the centre-point. The system of Theodore differed from that of Augustine in the great and important respect, that in Theodore's view grace and redemption were *necessarily* and *naturally* connected with Nature or Creation, as the means of removing its concreated imperfection, and of elevating it to a higher grade of excellence, while in Augustine's theory Nature or Creation is originally good and perfect, and grace and redemption are the *anomalous* method employed to remedy and overcome the effects of voluntary and culpable apostasy and corruption in the Creation. According to Augustine, Christ the Redeemer exerts an entirely transformative power upon Nature corrupted and fallen from its primitively perfect state. According to Theodore, Christ the Redeemer exerts only a formative, educational, and elevating power upon Nature as such, and as it comes from the hand of God. Theodore's Christology, also, differed from Augustine's, not only in that he divided the natures in the Person of Christ (§ 87), but

§ 93.

THE SEMI-PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.

Geffcken Historia Semipelagianismi antiquissima. Wiggers Geschichte des Semipelagianismus. Neander Church History, II. 627—651.

The logical result of the Pelagian controversy was the monergistic theory that man being *totally*[1] depraved, the *sole efficient* agency in his regeneration is that of God. Whoever is saved by divine grace, is saved entirely without his own meritorious co-operation; but whoever is lost is simply left in his already existing apostasy and guilt. To a certain class of minds it seemed a warrantable deduction from this theory, that the withholding of irresistible or saving grace is the producing cause of the perdition of the non-elect, and that the guilt of their perdition, consequently, does not rest upon themselves. The Augustinian doctrine of predestination also seemed to this class to lead to fatalism. Hence they deemed it necessary to take a middle way between strict Pelagianism and strict Augustinianism, and adopted the synergistic theory of regeneration, with which, we have seen, Augustine himself had commenced. They conditioned the efficiency of divine grace in the individual, upon an internal recipiency and susceptibility on his part; but while Augustine in his matured and final system referred this, and all those subjective qualities of the individual whereby

---

also in that he regarded the death of Christ as merely a part of his example as the ideal of holiness, and the point of transition in Christ's own life from conflict to victory; while Augustine regarded it as the substituted judicial suffering endured by Christ for the guilty. Theodore also adopted the Origenistic tenet of the apocatastasis.

[1] According to the synergistic theory the depravity of the human will is not strictly total. Synergism assumes some, however slight, inclination to the holy and the good in the apostate human soul — a faint *clinamen*, at least, which forms a point of contact between the human and the divine Spirit. This, so far goes, is not "enmity" (Rom viii. 7) towards the spiritual, and hence can synergize with the Holy Spirit. — *Translator.*

he becomes more inclined than another to yield to the influences of the Spirit, to preparatory and prevenient grace, this class of minds referred this element and trait of recipiency solely to the individual, as the human factor and coefficient in regeneration furnished by the subject himself. From this attempt to find a middle position between Pelagianism and Augustinianism sprang the so-called *Semi-Pelagian Controversy.*[1]

The first beginnings of the controversy were in North-Africa. The monks of the cloister of *Adrumetum* were most of them adherents of the Augustinian theory, but had fallen into dispute respecting its meaning. Some of them, by the doctrine of absolute predestination, had been thrown into great mental doubt and despair. Others were making it the occasion of total indifference, and even licentiousness.[2] A third portion were seeking to solve the problem by the via media of synergism. The abbot of the cloister referred the case, in 427, to Augustine who endeavored in his two treatises, *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, and *De correptione et gratia*, to relieve the difficulties of the monks, and seems to have been successful.— Almost contemporaneously with this movement in North-Africa, a much more important tendency divergent from Augustinianism began to show itself in *Gaul.* Here a theological party arose, acknowledging a sort of original sin, a sort of insufficiency to good in the natural man, and even a sort of prevenient grace, and which thus far seemed to depart from strict and proper Pelagianism; but, on the other hand, making the efficiency of regenerating grace to depend upon an already existing inclination or homogeneous susceptibility to grace in the individual, which susceptibility was regarded as the product of human power, this party verged decidedly towards the Pelagian anthropology, and opposed with Pelagian energy the Augustinian doctrine of irresistible grace, and of an unconditional decree of election. At the head of the Semi-Pelagians in Southern Gaul stood the Abbot *John Cassian*[1] of Marseilles, a pupil of Chrysostom, probably from the region of the Black Sea, — one of the so-called Scythian monks, who had come to Marseilles and founded a cloister. According to his view, an inclination to sin has certainly come upon the whole race through Adam's fall, but not so great but that man might attain to holiness if he would go forward in the work of self-improvement, though not without God's supplementary and co-operating grace.[2] Cassian held to the necessity of a constant *reciprocal* action between grace and free will, in order to regeneration. The divine efficiency, consequently, is sometimes prior, and sometimes subsequent to the human efficiency in the process, — being sometimes prevenient grace and sometimes postvenient, — according to the difference in individuals in respect to natural susceptibility to good. As the divine blessing is of no use to the husbandman without his own labor, and the labor on the other hand is nothing without the divine blessing, so is it with grace and man's will; grace operates according to the individual's susceptibility for grace. Holding this view, Cassian regarded the Augustinian doctrine of man's *total* depravity, with its two logical deductions, — his entire inability to operate efficiently towards his own regeneration, and his entire dependence upon the predestinating and electing decree of salvation on the part of God, — as leading either to false security on the one hand, or despair on the other. And even if these doctrines were true ones, they ought not to be preached, because they only generated subtile and useless speculations.[3] Augustine received accounts, in 429, of this Semi-Pelagian movement in Gaul, from his Gallic friends *Prosper* of Aquitania (afterwards the secretary of Leo the Great), and *Hilary*, and immediately addressed himself to a justification of his own system, in the treatises *De predestinatione sanctorum*, and *De dono perseverantiae.* But he did not succeed in convincing the Semi-Pelagian theologians, and the controversy was continued after the death of Augustine by *Prosper*, who in his own writings[1] set forth and defended a moderate Augustinianism, in opposition to the party of *Massiliensians.* At Prosper's suggestion, the Roman bishop *Coelestinus* mingled in the controversy,[2] and addressed a letter to the Gallic bishops, in which he blamed those who desired to raise recondite questions, who obstinately persisted in false statements, and who attacked the memory of the blessed Augustine, but at the same time giving no definite expression of opinion respecting the points at issue. The party of Semi-Pelagians continued, nevertheless, to extend more and more among the monks of Southern Gaul, — the doctrine of the meritoriousness of a monk's life and works being compatible with the synergistic theory, but logically excluded by the monergism of Augustine. Among the noteworthy men of the party was the monk and presbyter *Vincent*, of the island-cloister of *Lerins* (died about 450), — the author of the famous *Commonitorium*[3] *pro catholicae fidei antiquitate* (*adversus profanos omnium haereticorum novitates, libri II.*, writ-

---

[1] The schoolmen first gave the name of Semi-Pelagians to this party. Previously they had been called the Massiliensians.

[2] In reference to this class, Augustine says (*De correptione.* c. 7), — Quicunque ab illa originali damnatione ista divinae gratiae largitate discreti sunt, procuratur eis audiendum evangelium, et cum audiunt, credunt, et in fide, quae per dilectionem operatur, usque in finem perseverant, et si quando exorbitant, correpti emendantur. Compare Augustini Retractationes II. 66, 67; Epistolae 214—216.

---

[1] Of his writings there are extant: *XXIV Collationes patrum; De institutis Coenobiorum libri XII* (Comp. § 74, 2); *De incarnatione Christi adversus Nestorium libri VII.* Opera ed. Gazaeus, Duaci. 1616. 3 vols. auct. Atrebati. 1628. fol. — Compare Wiggers De Johanne Cassiano Massiliensi, qui Semi-Pelagianismi auctor vulgo perhibetur.

[2] Cassian's view is found particularly expressed in the 13th Collatio.

[3] The fundamental principle of the system of Cassian was the idea of a benevo-

---

lence on the part of God that extends to all beings, that wills the happiness of all, and makes everything, even the punishment of the wicked, subservient to this one end. Accordingly, he regarded the existing sinfulness of mankind, or, rather, the conflict between the flesh and the spirit, as ordained for a salutary and beneficial purpose.

[1] His principal work is *De gratia Dei et libero arbitrio contra Collatorem.* Besides this, there are extant: *Letters* and *Poems* (particularly the *Carmen de ingratis*, — in defence of his revered Augustine, and in opposition to the opponents of the doctrine of grace); six smaller controversial tracts; and a *Chronicon* reaching to the year 455. Opera Par. 1711; Rom. 1758.

[2] With great skill he sought to avoid every statement that would conflict with the moral feeling of a Christian. To preclude the charge, that God is made the author of sin, he cites the position of Augustine that all human sin flows from Adam's first act of apostasy, which was self-determined and voluntary.

[3] The principle enunciated in this work is, that that which has in its favor the testimony of Christian antiquity, of the whole church, and of the general councils,

ten in 434), which lays down the criteria and tests of the Catholic faith and doctrine.

After Augustine's death many of the adherents of his system, and to some extent *Prosper* himself, were inclined to lay more stress upon the doctrine of divine grace, and to emphasize somewhat less the particular and positive features in the doctrine of predestination. This tendency, the germs of which are seen in the writings of Prosper, finds a full and clear expression in the subtle, acute, and able work *De vocatione gentium*,[1] — in all probability composed in the days of

---

or, in case this is lacking, of distinguished fathers from different portions of the church, is to be regarded as the normative "sensus ecclesiasticus et catholicus" in determining the meaning of Scripture. The three criteria, consequently, of the Catholic doctrine are vetustas, universalitas, and consensio (what has been believed *semper*, *ubique*, *et ab omnibus*). This principle, now for the first time distinctly enunciated by Vincent, had been acted upon from the first. It had been urged by Irenaeus in his attack upon the Gnostics; and by Augustine in his polemics against the Manichaeans, in which connection (Contra Manichaeos, c. 5) he uttered his famous: "ego vero evangelio non crederem, nisi me catholicae ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas." [See Calvin's interpretation of this, Institutes, I. 7, 3. The value of this principle depends altogether upon the impartiality and truthfulness of its application. Vincent follows his own individual bias in selecting testimony. In reference, e.g. to the anthropological questions then to be settled by the sensus catholicus he occupied the Semi-Pelagian point of view, and cites authorities accordingly, — "neglecting," says Neander, "to mention Augustine among the many church-teachers who are praised by him." The Papal Church following the lead of Vincent omits in its generalization from the past history of the church all that opposes its own distinctive tenets, and culls out only that which favors them. — *Translator*.]

[1] In order to point out an entire harmony between grace and free will, this work distinguishes three forms of will: the voluntas sensualis (directed solely to things of sense, like the will of the child or the savage); the voluntas animalis (directed to intellectual but earthly ends, as fame, power, learning, etc.); and the voluntas spiritalis (the human will attracted and actuated by the immutable divine will). In this latter instance of the spiritual will, all is divine, and all is human, according to the point of view that is assumed, — all is divine, if reference be had to the originating author, and all is human if reference be had to the recipient subject. With respect to grace, accordingly, this treatise makes a distinction between "general" and "special" grace, parallel with that between the voluntas animalis and spiritalis. By the operation of "general" grace in the voluntas animalis, man is endowed with the innate consciousness of God and the knowledge of his own duty, thereby becoming capable of moral perfection. But this mere capability requires in *fallen* man the influence of "special" grace in order to become a living actuality. Special grace converts the voluntas animalis into the voluntas spiritalis. Special grace is imparted to some, and not to others, — in connection with

his deaconship by *Leo the Great*, bishop of Rome 440—461. In opposition to this mode of stating the Augustinian system, other pupils of Augustine, on the contrary, designedly enunciated the doctrine of predestination in its isolated form, and in disconnection from cognate truths, and in the most abrupt and startling phraseology. The Semi-Pelagians now adroitly availed themselves of both of these modes of stating Augustinianism, not only in order to make a direct attack upon the doctrine of predestination, notwithstanding the great authority and influence of Augustine's name, but also, (by culling out the harshest and crudest forms in which the doctrine had been enunciated,) in order to represent it as a newly risen heresy held by a class whom they called *Predestinationists.* This was done, particularly, in the Semi-Pelagian treatise entitled *Praedestinatus*,[1] composed probably by the younger *Arnobius* about 461.[2] By these means, and owing to the then general prevalence of Semi-Pelagianism in a part of Gaul, it was brought about, that at the councils of *Arles* and *Lyons* (472—475) the presbyter *Lucidus* a defender of strict Augustinianism, though not a comprehensive and wise one, was condemned, and compelled to retract; and the Semi-Pelagian system, enunciated, at the request of the first men-

---

which Augustinian position, this treatise lays down the three following propositions: 1. God wills that all men should be saved, so far as general grace is concerned; 2. No one is saved through his own merit, but every one who is actually saved is saved by special grace; 3. Into the depths of the divine decree, by which special grace is given to some and not to others, no man is able to penetrate.— Besides this work *De vocatione*, which is *probably* Leo's, there are extant of Leo's Writings (See § 71, 4): 95 *Homilies;* and an important collection of *Letters*, among which is the famous *Epistola ad Flavianum*. characterized by great dogmatic acuteness, and making a decided impression upon the theology of the East, as the *De vocatione* did upon the anthropology of the West. — Opera ed. Quesnel. Par. 1675; ed. 2d Lugd. 1700. 2 vols.; also ed. Ballerinus. Venet. 1755–57. 3 vols.

[1] This work consists: 1. of a description of 90 Heresies ending with that of Predestination; 2. of a book under Augustine's name, professing to give the views of the Predestinationists; 3. of a refutation of the 2d part. It has been edited by Sirmond. Par. 1645; also in Gallandi Bibliotheca T. X. p. 357 sq.; and in Bibliotheca Patrum Lugdunensium XXVII. 543.

[2] The author of a *Commentarius in Psalmos* (in Bibliotheca Patrum Lugd. VIII. 238).

tioned synod, by *Faustus* bishop of Rhegium, in his work *De gratia Dei et humanae mentis libero arbitrio*,[1] was approved.

But though now and for some time afterwards Semi-Pelagianism asserted an ecclesiastical authority for itself in Gaul, the Augustinian system continued to be adopted with firmness and earnestness in Africa and Italy. Several North-African bishops who had been driven from their country by the Arian Vandals, and were residing in Sardinia and Corsica, became acquainted with the Gallic Semi-Pelagianism as exhibited in the treatise of Faustus. Among them was *Fulgentius* († 533) bishop of Ruspe in Numidia, a man distinguished by acuteness and active piety, who was ordained bishop by the Catholics in 508 in opposition to the imperial will, and was therefore, with more than sixty others, banished from his native land until 523.[3] In answer to a request from Constantinople that he would give his opinion of Faustus's work, *Hormisdas* bishop of Rome (514—523) had declared for the Augustinian system, though expressing himself in very moderate terms respecting that of Faustus. The theopaschite Scythian monks, who were then very active both at Constantinople and at Rome, and were violent opponents of

---

[1] In this work (Bibl. Pat. Lugd. VIII. p. 525), Faustus compares the relation between the divine efficiency and the human activity, to the relation between the divine and human natures in Christ's Person,—a comparison which would be justifiable upon the theory of synergism, provided human nature were now sinless like the humanity of Christ, or of Adam before the fall. Faustus asserted an unextinguishable germ of goodness in human nature. an inwardly implanted spark, as he expressed it, which is effectual when fed by man with the assistance of divine grace (ab homine cum Dei gratia nutritus).—Previous to this, Faustus had asserted the corporeality of the soul in a controversy with *Claudianus Mamertus*, a presbyter of Vienne († 474), who had been educated by the study of Augustine's writings.

[2] To the Semi-Pelagians of this time, belonged the presbyter *Gennadius* of Marseilles, the continuator of Jerome's *Catalogus*, and the author of a treatise *De fide* s. de dogmatibus ecclesiasticis.

[3] Fulgentius had already, previously to engaging in the Semi-Pelagian controversy, defended the Augustinian system in his treatise *De incarnatione et gratia*. Besides this, and the work mentioned above, there are extant, from him, several writings against the Arians, together with other dogmatic tracts, discourses, and letters.—Opera ed. Sirmond. Par. 1623; Par. 1684; Ven. 1742. They are also in the Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum T. IX.

Pelagianism, regarded this answer of the Roman bishop as involving a self-contradiction. Not succeeding at Rome, they carried the question respecting the doctrine of Faustus to the banished North-African bishops. *Fulgentius* now composed, in refutation of Faustus, his treatise *De veritate praedestinationis et gratia Dei*, and *De gratia et libero arbitrio responsiones*, — the latter of which is not extant. By these works, the Semi-Pelagian controversy was again revived, and in the Gallic church itself vigorous and able defenders of Augustinianism now arose, who were greatly aided and strengthened by the intrinsic logical superiority, and greater self-consistence, of the system of the North-African father. Of these, the most important was the revered archbishop *Caesarius* of Arles, — born in Gaul in 470, made archbishop in 501, and died on the 27th of August 542 almost upon the anniversary of the death of Augustine, as he desired, — a man who owed to the study of Augustine his more than commonly profound Christian experience, and who adopted the Augustinian doctrine of grace with living and practical fervor.[1] In this period of great civil distractions, Caesarius showed himself a man of untiring and restless energy, laboring for the revival of a living piety in the churches, training up capable clergymen, cultivating church psalmody and music, and employing every possible instrumentality, in the exercise of a tender pity and an unwearied Christian benevolence, to ameliorate the condition of the poor, the sick, and, especially in those times of barbaric warfare, of *prisoners*. Under the influence of Caesarius, in particular, the council of *Orange* (Arausio), in 529, laid down the Augustinian system as the Catholic orthodoxy, not merely in opposition to Pelagianism, but also in opposition to Semi-Pelagianism, and all grades of the synergistic theory of regeneration.[1] In respect to the subject of predestination, the council expressed itself in opposition to the doctrine of predestination *to sin*, — regarding this form of predestination, which had, nevertheless, been held by Augustine, as incompatible with man's responsible agency in the origin of sin. The Semi-Pelagian system was distinctly rejected, without the mention, however, of the names of any of its adherents. The decisions of the council of Orange were approved in the same year by the synod of *Valence*, and in 539 by the Roman bishop *Boniface II.* (530—532).

---

[1] He regarded the Semi-Pelagian theory of a partial source of goodness in man and out of God, as one that ministered to human pride, although he was moderate and guarded in respect to the Augustinian doctrine of predestination. — Of his works there are extant: *Homilies*, and *Sermons* (preserved among the writings of Augustine, also in Gallandi Bibl. Patrum, and in the Biblioth. Patrum Lugdunensium); 5 *Letters* (in Bib. Patrum); and some tracts respecting Monachism. A work *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, mentioned in Gennadii Catal. c. 86, is lost, unless the decrees of the council of Orange are to be taken for it. Compare the Vita Caesarii by his pupil Cyprian; and Neander Denkwürdigkeiten III 53—107.

The fundamental and essential positions of Augustinianism respecting sin and grace, — in other words, the most definite and decided form of Anti-Pelagianism, — was thus established in the Western church as the theoretical norm and test of orthodoxy.[2]

---

[1] "The doctrine of prevenient grace, as the cause of even the *first motions* of all goodness, was asserted in the strict sense of Augustine. No man has anything which can strictly be called his own, but falsehood and sin." Neander's Church History, II. 650.

[2] The tendency to the synergistic theory was, however, by no means extirpated by the theoretic monergism which had been adopted at Orange and Valence. The meritorious co-efficiency of the human with the divine, in regeneration, became more and more the practical faith of the declining Western Church, notwithstanding the reactionary endeavors of minds like *Gottschalk* and others, until, in the fully-defined Papal anthropology enunciated at Trent, Semi-Pelagianism with its logical result became ecclesiastically, as well as practically, triumphant over the system of its great North-African opposer and antagonist. — *Translator.*

CHAPTER SECOND.

SECTS.

§ 94.

AUDIANS, PRISCILLIANISTS, HYPSISTARIANS, ETC.

The history of sects in the first three centuries evinces, that in proportion as the church was the more pure in doctrine and life, the more impure were the parties that separated themselves from it. The history of the church after the 9th century evinces, that in proportion as the church partially lost purity in doctrine and life, the number of sects increased; and that in proportion as the universal visible church became apostate and ceased altogether to be the true Christian church, the parties separating themselves from it and opposing themselves to it came to represent, with a fidelity corresponding to their own freedom from heretical and fanatical elements, the scriptural and spiritual traits of the universal invisible church. The present period (311—590) and the next succeeding one (590—814) exhibit phenomena of a medium character in this respect, — the former presenting features resembling rather those of the first and purer centuries in church history, while the latter shows the shadow of the advancing corruption of the Middle Ages. Inasmuch as in this period, the corruption which had indeed arisen within the church had by no means penetrated and pervaded the entire structure, and the church as a whole still held to the doctrine and the faith of the first period, we find the sects corrupt in their general features, yet with occasional or accidental lineaments of truth. Besides the heresies which have been mentioned in the preceding chapter upon the history of doctrine, two sects antagonistic to the church and founded upon very dissimilar principles, exhibit characteristics that are marked and worthy of notice.

1. *Audius*, or more properly *Udo*, a Mesopotamian layman of strict Christian walk and conduct, in the first half of the 4th century, impelled by an extravagant zeal for outward reformation that was not always guided by wisdom, and an extreme veneration for ancient usages, had rebuked with an unsparing severity the worldliness of many of the clergy around him, and having been persecuted therefor had separated entirely from the Catholic church. Having at length been banished to Scythia, he labored for the spread of Christianity among the Goths. The sect of *Audians*, (to which even some Catholic bishops joined themselves, and in regard to which, we know only that they adopted anthropomorphite errors from Audius their bishop, and rejected the Nicene decision respecting Easter (§ 78) as an innovation,) avoided with the greatest strictness all intercourse with the members of the Catholic church, and continued to exist as a separate body to the beginning of the 5th century.[1]

2. On the other hand, there were some sects which were founded upon a thoroughly heretical basis. The old *Gnostics* and *Manichaeans*, to some extent separate from each other, and to some extent commingling with each other, had continued to propagate themselves, — Gnosticism in the East, chiefly in Syria; and Manichaeism mostly in North-Africa. They had been tolerated by Constantine the Great; but from the time of Valentinian I. they had been persecuted. This only heightened their fanaticism, as if they, the poor and the persecuted, were the only true Christians, and no amount of persecution had succeeded in exterminating them. In North-Africa, the Manichaean *Faustus*, about the year

---

[1] Epiphanius Haer. 70; Theodoret Haer. fabb. IV. 10; Theodoret Hist. Eccl. IV. 9; Ephraem. Serm. 24. c. haeres. (Opp. II. 493).

400, succeeded by his acuteness and wit in giving a new brilliance to Manichaeism; a brilliance, however, that could not long conceal from the eyes of the discerning the intrinsic weakness of a system that had become influential, for the moment, only by the adroitness of its advocate.[1]

After the middle of the 4th century, Gnostic-Manichaean doctrines and tendencies spread, probably from Africa, to *Spain* also, where there sprang up a gnosticizing Manichaeism clothed in the costume of the Occidental asceticism. These Gnostic-Manichaean ideas were adopted by a rich Spaniard *Priscillianus*,[2] well known for the ascetic strictness of his life, and were moulded by him into a peculiar system of his own. The Priscillian system is not very clearly understood, and is known only by the reports of opponents; but it seems to have been a combination of the emanation-system of the Syrian-Gnostics and Manichaeans with the Saturninian and Ophite dualism, together with a mixture of astrology, and some other elements that were not distinctly heretical.[3] The eloquence of Priscillian, and his ascetic strictness (he enjoined celibacy), made him many adherents, among whom were two bishops, *Instantius* and *Salvianus*. Even the violent persecuting measures employed by the Catholic church, under the lead of *Hyginus* bishop of Cordova (who afterwards became their protector), and *Idacius* bishop of Merida, only served to promote the growth of the sect. In the year 380, the synod of *Caesar-Augusta* (Saragossa) passed sentence of excommunication upon Priscillian and his adherents, and the violent and immoral bishop *Ithacius* of Ossonuba was intrusted with the execution of the decrees of the synod. The emperor *Gratian*, in addition, condemned the Priscillianists to exile. Priscillian succeeded in bribing an influential state-officer, and in producing such a reaction at court, that Ithacius himself was compelled to flee into Gaul. But the death of Gratian in 383, and the rule of the usurper *Maximus*, made an entire change. Ithacius found access to the new emperor at Triers, and now as many of the Priscillianists as could be were arrested, and the synod of *Bordeaux* (Burdigala) was convened, in 384, to give a judgment. From the adverse decision of this synod, Priscillian was foolish enough to appeal to Maximus. The emperor, though he had promised the venerable bishop *Martin* of Tours that severe measures should not be used,[1] under the influence of Ithacius, and stimulated by his own desire for the wealth of Priscillian and his adherents, caused the rack to be employed. Under the torture, some of the Priscillianists confessed to the charge of licentiousness, and unnatural lusts, in their assemblages, which had been brought against the sect, and in 385 Priscillian was beheaded at Triers, — the first instance of a capital sentence being judicially passed upon a heretic, and the first instance of the infliction of the death-penalty for heresy. Soon after, two of Priscillian's friends were beheaded at Triers, and others, after the confiscation of their goods, were banished. *Theognistus* alone, of all the bishops present at Triers,[2] ventured to declare against such proceedings; and, indeed, with so much decision, that after the return of Martin to Triers, the two bishops, notwithstanding the entreaties and threats of Maximus, withdrew fellowship from the other bishops, until at length Martin yielded upon condition that the imperial soldiers who had been sent to Spain to hunt out the Priscillianists, and probably also some earnest-minded orthodox Christians under their name, were recalled. The Priscillianists, holding falsehood to be lawful when employed for the purpose of preserving and extending themselves as a sect,[1] continued to increase in spite of this and all the persecutions that followed, and we find the council of *Bracara* (Braga) passing decrees against them in 563.

---

[1] Of Faustus's work in defence of Manichaeism, important fragments have been preserved in Augustine's treatise *Contra Faustum libri XXXIII.* (Compare infra § 54).

[2] See Sulpicius Severus, Hist. Sac. II. 46—51; Hieron. Epist. 139; Augustin. Epist. 36, 140, 236; Orosii Consultatio de errore Priscillianistarum, in Aug. Opp. VIII. 448.

[3] Priscillian acknowledged the authority of the Old Testament, explaining it allegorically, although he did not regard the God of the Old Testament as exactly one and the same being with the God of the New. At the same time, he did not find all he wanted in the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, and made use of some apocryphal writings, in addition.

---

[1] Martin, indignant at the proposed settlement of an ecclesiastical matter before a secular tribunal, demanded that the Priscillianists should simply be condemned as heretical before an episcopal body, and that communion between them and the church should cease.

[2] But several bishops who were not in the council, — as *Ambrose* of Milan and *Siricius* of Rome, — decidedly as they rejected the Priscillianist doctrines, agreed with Theognistus and Martin in their judgment, and raised their voices against what had been done.

Besides these two, there were in this period some other less prominent heretical sects. Among them was the Egyptian sect of *Rhetorians* at Alexandria, in the 4th century, mentioned by Athanasius (Contra Apollinar. I. 6), and Philastrius (Haeres. § 91). They seem to have been characterized by a doctrinal indifferentism, and, under the lead of a certain *Rhetorius*, to have formed the theory, in the midst of the vehement dogmatical conflicts going on all around them, that all heretics had the truth, each in his own way. — There were also in the 4th century some sects of purely heathen origin, composed of those who would adopt neither paganism nor Christianity, and who yet were not prepared to live without some sort of a religion and worship. Such was the sect of *Hypsistarians* (*ὑψίστῳ ϑεῷ προσκυνοῦντες*) in Cappadocia, concerning whom we have only a few notices from Gregory Nazianzen and Gregory Nyssa. The principal account of them is contained in the discourse which Gregory Nazianzen delivered at the funeral of his father, who had belonged to this sect for a long time (Orat. XVIII. 5). It is evident from this notice of the Hypsistarians that they were not a Christian sect, but writers are not agreed respecting their real views. According to *Boehmer*[2] they adopted the relics of a primitive religion which had spread over all Asia, and which had been formed by the fusion of monotheism with Sabaeism, — a view which is not supported upon internal grounds. In the opinion of *Ullmann*,[3] which is not much more probable, the Hypsistarian religion was a mixture of Judaism and the Old-Persian religion. Another writer[1] holds that this sect arose during the religious fermentations of the first century, and was closely related to the Essenes and Therapeutae. The most probable theory is, that it sprang up, when paganism was tottering in its fall, from an attempt to mix Christianity with paganism (§ 63). That class of pagans who had as little belief in their ancestral gods as they had in Christ, and who lived on indifferent to both religions alike in the period of their great collision and antagonism, would naturally adopt an altogether atheistic theory, or at least a religion of only the most vague and general kind. The more earnest-minded of this class, however, would feel the need of some sort of religious association, and so the sect of Hypsistarians arose, — a new species of proselytes of the gate, with their worship of one god alone, and yet with their veneration of *τὸ πῦρ καὶ τὰ λύχνα,* together with an observance of the Sabbath and of rules respecting food. To the Hypsistarians may be added the kindred sects of the *Euphemites* in the East, and the *Coelicolae* in Africa, and some others, — all of whom seem to have believed in the existence of the pagan gods, yet worshipped in their prayer-houses only one Supreme Deity above and over all, with splendid illuminations, and hymns, and prayers, at morning and evening twilight. All such religious phenomena as these of the 4th century would naturally disappear within a few generations, before the external and internal power of Christianity, — but only to reappear in different circumstances, and under a new form, in *Islamism.*

---

[1] "Jura! perjura! secretum prodere noli!" Their bishop *Dictinnus* of Astorga about 400, who ultimately came over to the Catholic church, defended this principle in a treatise. Augustine exposed the immorality of this maxim: See note on p. 375.

[2] De Hypsistariis.

[3] De Hypsistariis.

---

[1] In the Jen. Lit. Zeitung, Dec. 1824.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

Year.	First Period.
1—311	
14	Augustus dies, Tiberius emperor. — Judas of Gamala.
28—37	Pontius Pilate.
33	*Christian Church established* by the Pentecostal effusion.
33—60	*First period in the Apostolic Age.* Apostolic conflict with pseudo-Judaism and Paganism. — First origin of a New Testament literature.
35	Stephen the first martyr.
36	Conversion of Paul.
41	Herod Agrippa I. king of all Palestine.
41—54	Claudius emperor.
44	James the Elder beheaded. — Χριστιανοί at Antioch.
45	*First apostolic journey of Paul.*
50	*Convention of Apostles and Elders* at Jerusalem. — Apollonius of Tyana.
51 or 52	*Second apostolic journey of Paul.*
54—68	Nero emperor.
54 or 55	*Third apostolic journey of Paul.*
60—70	*Transition period in the Apostolic Age.* Development of a refined pseudo-Judaistic and paganizing Anti-Christianity, and the Apostolic opposition to it. — Continuation of the New Testament literature.
61	Paul imprisoned at Rome.
64	Christian Persecution at Rome. — James the Younger suffers martyrdom.
66	Commencement of the Jewish War.
67 or 68	Peter and Paul suffer martyrdom at Rome.
69—79	Vespasian emperor.
70	Destruction of Jerusalem.
70—100	*Second period in the Apostolic Age.* Complete formation of a Judaistic-Paganizing Anti-Christianity, and the concluding Apostolic (Johannean) opposition to it. — Completion of a New Testament literature.
79—81	Titus emperor.
81—96	Domitian emperor.
96—98	Nerva emperor.
98—117	Trajan emperor. Christian persecution.

Year.	
100	Clement of Rome.
107	Simeon of Jerusalem martyred.
115	Ignatius martyred.
117—138	Hadrian emperor.
125	Basilides. Saturninus.
132—135	Barcochba.
138—161	Antoninus Pius emperor.
140	Valentinus.
150	Celsus. Marcion. — Justin Martyr.
157—171	Montanus. — Synods.
160	Easter controversy between Polycarp and Anicetus. — Ophites.
161—180	Marcus Aurelius emperor. Christian persecution.
163	Justin Martyr dies.
167	Persecution at Smyrna.
168	Polycarp martyred.
170	Bardesanes. Carpocrates. — Easter controversy between Claudius Apollinaris and Melito of Sardis.
177	Persecutions at Lyons and Vienne. Irenaeus.
180—193	Commodus emperor.
180	Lucian of Samosata. — School at Alexandria.
193—211	Septimius Severus emperor.
196	Easter controversy between Polycrates of Ephesus and Victor of Rome. — Caius of Rome.
200	Severus, Severians. Praxeas. Theodotus. Artemon. Hermogenes. — Clement of Alexandria. — New Testament Homolegomena.
201	Tertullian a Montanist.
202	Christian persecution.
211—217	Caracalla emperor.
218—222	Heliogabalus emperor.
219	Mishna.
220	Hippolytus. Noëtus. Callistus. Tertullian dies.
222—235	Alexander Severus emperor.
232	Origen banished from Alexandria.
235—238	Maximin the Thracian emperor. Christian persecution.
238—244	Gordian emperor.
243	Ammonius Saccas dies.
244—249	Philip the Arabian emperor.
244	Arabian synod tries Beryll.
248	Cyprian bishop of Carthage. Schism of Felicissimus.
249—251	Decius emperor. Christian persecution. Paul of Thebes.
250	*Provincial synods universal.* — Sabellius.
251	Gallus emperor. — Novatian schism at Rome.
254	Origen dies.
254—259	Valerian emperor.
257 sq.	Christian persecution.
258	Cyprian martyred.
259—268	Gallienus emperor. *Christianity religio licita.*
260	Paul of Samosata.
264 & 269	Antiochian synods try Paul of Samosata.
265	Dionysius of Alexandria dies.
270—275	Aurelian emperor.
270	Gregory Thaumaturgus and Photinus die.

Year.	
276	Mani dies.
284—305	Diocletian emperor.
290	School at Antioch.
296	Diocletian's law against the Manichaeans.
303—311	Persecutions under Diocletian and Galerius.
304	Porphyry the New-Platonic dies. — Hierocles.
305	Synod at Elvira.
306	Meletian schism in Egypt.
306—337	*Constantine emperor.*
309	Pamphilus martyred.

311—590 Second Period.

310—381	Sapores II. king of Persia, persecutes the Christians.
311	Galerius dies. — Caecilianus bishop of Carthage. — Antony the eremite, now in Alexandria.
312	Expedition of Constantine against Maxentius in Rome ("Hac vince").
313	Licinius conquers Maximinus. — Donatus Magnus. Episcopal judgment at Rome against the Donatists.
314	Constantine conquers Licinius — Imperial decision at Carthage respecting the Donatists. Council of Arles; also of Neo-Caesarea, and Ancyra.
318	Arius.
319	Constantine releases clergymen from the munera publica.
321	Constantine represses Sabbath profanation. — Arius is excommunicated by bishop Alexander.
323	Constantine sole emperor.
325	*First oecumenical council, at Nice.* Nicene Symbol.
326	Athanasius bishop of Alexandria.
327	Frumentius missionary to Ethiopia.
330	Lactantius dies. — Conversion of the Iberians.
331	Eustathius of Antioch deposed by the Arians.
335	Synod of Tyre deposes Athanasius.
336	Athanasius exiled by the emperor. Arius dies. Marcellus of Ancyra deposed.
337	Constantine baptized, dies.
337—352	Julius bishop of Rome.
340	Eusebius of Caesarea and Paul of Thebes die. — Constantine II. dies.
340—395	Didymus of Alexandria.
341	*Constantius's first strict law against paganism.*
341 & 342	(Mostly Semi-Arian) Council at Antioch deposes Athanasius anew, and draws up four confessions of faith.
343 sq.	Persecution of Christians in Persia.
343	Simeon, bishop of Seleucia, martyred.
345	Semi-Arian council at Antioch draws up a 5th confession, not accepted by the Western Nicenes; rejects the doctrine of Photinus.

Year.	
? 345	Council at Sardica. Oriental Anti-Nicene council at Philippopolis.
346	Synod of Milan, against Photinus.
348	Ulphilas bishop of the Goths. Pachomius dies.
350—361	Constantius sole emperor.
350	Aërius presbyter at Sebaste.
351	Council of Anti-Nicenes at Sirmium. Marcellus's doctrine condemned, Photinus deposed.
353	Anti-Nicene synod at Arles.
354	Augustine born.
355	Eustathius defends Monachism.— Anti-Nicene synod of Milan. Athanasius again deposed. Ulphilas and his Goths in the Roman empire.
356	Antony the eremite dies. — Aëtius and Eunomius. — Apparent complete victory of the Anti-Nicenes.
357	Arian council at Sirmium; 2d Sirmian symbol.
358	Semi-Arian council at Ancyra.
359	Arian assembly at Sirmium; 3d Sirmian symbol. Oriental council at Seleucia, and Occidental at Ariminum.
360	Meletius bishop of Antioch. Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, deposed.
? 360	Council of Laodicea.
361	Constantine dies. Julian the Apostate.
362	Athanasius, returned from exile, holds a synod at Alexandria.
363	Julian dies. Jovian emperor.
364	*Valentinian I. grants universal toleration.* Valens emperor in the East.
365	Law of Valens against the abuse of monachism.
366	Damasus bishop of Rome. Acacius dies.
367	Athanasius flees from the rage of the Arian Valens.
368	*Pagani.* Hilary of Poictiers dies. Optatus of Mileve.
370	Aëtius dies.
373	Athanasius dies. — Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssa.
374	Ambrose bishop of Milan. The Anti-Nicene bishop Auxentius of Milan dies.
375	Valentinian I. dies. Gratian emperor, and Valentinian II. in the East. The former renounces the dignity of pontifex maximus.
378	Diodorus bishop of Tarsus. — Gregory Nazianzen at Constantinople.
379—395	Theodosius I. the Great.
380	Synod of Caesar-Augusta excommunicates Priscillian and his adherents.
381	*Second oecumenical council, at Constantinople,* reaffirms the Nicene doctrine, and defines the doctrine of the Holy Ghost.
382	Apollinaris the younger dies. — Jerome at Rome.
384—398	Siricius bishop of Rome.
385	Priscillian beheaded. Jerome leaves Rome.
385—412	Theophilus patriarch of Alexandria.
386	Cyril of Jerusalem dies. Jerome in Bethlehem.
387	Augustine baptized. Chrysostom's Image-Sermons.
388	Jovinian.
390	Gregory Nazianzen and the orator Themistius die. Symmachus, the opponent of Christianity. Theodosius and Ambrose.

Year.	
391	Destruction of the Serapeion.
392	Valentinian II. dies. Theodosius sole emperor.
393	Council at Hippo Regius.
395	*Theodosius dies, and the empire is divided.* Libanius and Eunomius die.
395—423	Honorius emperor in the West.
395—408	Arcadius emperor in the East.
396	Augustine bishop of Hippo Regius (co-bishop the year previous).
397	Ambrose of Milan dies. Chrysostom patriarch of Constantinople. Council at Carthage. Theophilus of Alexandria temporarily adjusts the Origenistic controversy between John and Rufinus, on the one side, and Jerome and Epiphanius, on the other.
398—402	Anastasius bishop of Rome.
398	Synod at Carthage, in favor of presbyterial influence.
399 & 400	Alexandrine synods against Origen. Second Origenistic controversy.
400	Martin of Tours dies. Prudentius. Faustus the Manichacan.
401	Attack of Theophilus of Alexandria upon Chrysostom.
401—420	Jezdegerdes I. king of Persia persecutes the Christians.
402—416	Innocent I. bishop of Rome.
403	Epiphanius bishop of Salamis dies. Synodus ad Quercum. Chrysostom deposed, excommunicated, exiled, and recalled. Council at Carthage, in reference to the Donatists.
404	Vigilantius. — Chrysostom exiled again.
405	Severer laws against the Donatists.
407	Chrysostom dies in exile.
408—450	Theodosius II. emperor in the East.
410	Synesius bishop of Ptolemais. Alaric in Rome.
411	Collatio cum Donatistis at Carthage.
412	Cyril of Alexandria. — Coelestius excommunicated by a synod at Carthage.
415	Pelagius apparently justifies himself at the synods of Jerusalem and Diospolis.
416	Synods of Mileve and Carthage condemn Pelagianism.
417—418	Zosimus bishop of Rome.
418	General synod at Carthage, against Pelagius (and also against appealing to Rome).
420	Simeon Stylites. Jerome dies. Theodoret bishop of Cyrus.
420—438	Varanes V., king of Persia, persecutes the Christians.
422—427	War between Theodosius II. and the Persians.
425—455	Valentinian III. emperor in the East.
425	Imperial laws against spectacles upon Sunday and Pentecost.
428	Nestorius patriarch of Constantinople.
429	The (Arian) Vandals in North-Africa. Theodore of Mopsuestia dies. Marius Mercator presents the emperor his treatise against Pelagianism.
430	Palladius, missionary in Ireland without success. Synod at Alexandria; Cyril's 12 Anathemas. Coelestinus, bishop of Rome, condemns Pelagius. Augustine dies.
431	*Third oecumenical council, at Ephesus,* against Nestorius; condemns, also, Pelagianism.
432	Patrick in Ireland. Deposition of Nestorius confirmed by the emperor.

Year.	
433	Agreement between Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch
435—489	Barsumas bishop of Nisibis.
436—457	Ibas bishop of Edessa.
440	Nestorius and Isidore of Pelusium die.
440—461	Leo the Great, bishop of Rome.
441	Council of Orange.
444	Cyril of Alexandria dies.
444—451	Dioscurus patriarch of Alexandria.
445	Valentinian III. issues a decree respecting the authority of the Roman sedes apostolica.
448	Eutychius, at a synod of Constantinople, deposed and exiled as a Monophysite.
449	Robber-Synod at Ephesus.
450	Pulcheria and Marcian. — Vincent of Lerins dies. — Severinus preaches in Noricum.
451	*Fourth oecumenical council, at Chalcedon*, condemns Monophysitism.
451—453	Outbreaks among the Monophysite monks in Palestine.
454	Dioscurus dies. — Proterius. — Timotheus Ailurus. — Peter Mongus.
457	Theodoret dies.
457—474	Leo I. emperor.
460	Patrick dies. — Council of Tours.
461	Arnobius the younger.
463	Peter Fuller, monophysite patriarch at Constantinople. — Studius, Studites.
472—475	Semi-Pelagian synods at Arles and Lyons.
474	Zeno the Isaurian, emperor.
476	*Downfall of the Western Roman empire.* — Zeno Isauricus driven out by Basiliscus.
477—491	Zeno Isauricus emperor.
482	Zeno's Henoticon.
484—519	No church communion between the (condemning) West, and the (condemned) monophysitizing East.
486	The Franks break into Gaul.
490	Faustus of Rhegium dies.
491—518	Anastasius emperor.
496	Baptism of the Frankish king Chlodwig by Remigius archbishop of Rheims. — Babaeus, Catholicus of the Chaldee Christians.
499	The whole Persian Church declares for the Nestorian doctrine.
500	Avitus of Vienne.
501	Caesarius, archbishop of Arles.
506	Council at Agde.
508	Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe. Philoxenus. Severus. (Syrian Monophysites).
517	Sigismund, king of the Burgundians, converted to the Catholic church from Arianism.
518—527	Justin I. emperor.
525	Avitus of Vienne and Boëthius die.
527—565	Justinian I. emperor. Phthartolatrae, Agnöetae. Aphthartodocetae: Aktistetae, Ktistolatrae (in Alexandria).
529	Monastic regulations of Benedict of Nursia. — Councils of Orange and Valence in favor of Augustinianism.
530—532	Boniface II. bishop of Rome.

Year.	
533	Fulgentius of Ruspe dies.
534	The kingdom of the Vandals is overthrown.
535	Cosmas Indicopleustes.
536	Council at Constantinople condemns Monophysitism. — Monophysite synod at Thiven rejects the Chalcedon doctrine.
538	Vigilius bishop of Rome. Cassiodorus, a monk.
541	The emperor and a synod at Constantinople condemn the errors of Origen.
541—578	Jacob Baradaeus. Jacobites.
542	Caesarius of Arles dies.
543	Benedict of Nursia dies.
544	The emperor condemns the *tria capitula.* Controversy of the Three Chapters, (relating to Theodore Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Ibas).
553	*Fifth oecumenical council, at Constantinople,* against the Three Chapters. — Downfall of the East-Gothic kingdom in Italy.
556	Dionysius Exiguus dies.
557	Synod at Paris (respecting the election of the clergy).
560	John Philoponus, tritheite. Damian. Stephen Niobes.
562	Cassiodorus dies.
563	Council of Bracara (Braga) issues decrees against the Priscillianists.
564	Justinian favors the Aphthartodocetae.
565	Justinian dies. The Irish Columba among the Picts in Scotland.
569 or 570	Mohammed born at Mecca.
572	Council at Bracara (Braga); in reference to visitatorial journeys.
578	John Scholasticus dies.
578—590	Pelagius II. bishop of Rome.
580	Council of Auxerre.
585	John Jejunator, patriarch of Constantinople, denominates himself at a council *ἐπίσκοπος οἰκουμενικός.*
589	Council at Toledo, adds "filioque" to the Niceno-Constantinopolitan symbol. Reccared, the Goth-Spanish king, joins the Catholic church.
590	Gregory the Great, bishop of Rome (dies 604).

GENERAL INDEX.

Abasgians, 257.
Abbas, 289
Abdas, 253.
Abgarus, 39. 71.
Abraham, 3.
Absolutio, 122.
Abyssinia, 74. 257. 370.
Acacius, of Armida, 253.
Acacius, of Caesarea, 324.
Acacius, of Constantinople, 362.
Acoluthi, 115.
Acta Pilati, 239.
Actistetae, 364.
Adam of Bremen, 12.
'Αδελφοὶ and ἀδελφαὶ of Jesus, 35.
Adeodatus, Augustine's son, 373.
Aedesius, 257.
Aelia Capitolina, 79. 155.
Aera Dionysiana, 39.
Aërius, 305.
Aëtius, 324.
Africa, 73. 257.
Agape, 144. 303.
Agapetus, 365.
Agnoëtae (Themistians), 364.
Agrippa. See Herod.
'Ακέφαλοι, 362.
'Ακοίμητοι, 289.
'Ακροώμενοι (audientes), 301.
Alaric, 259.
Alexander (Natalis). 17.
Alexander, of Alexandria, 313. 317.
Alexander, of Constantinople, 319.
Alexander, of Hierapolis, 354.
Alexander, of Abonoteichus, 81.
Alexander, of Jerusalem, 228.
Alexander Severus, 90.
Alexandria (Christianity there), 74; (persecution there), 96. 235; (sedes apostolica), 117; (Patriarchate), 272; (school), 149. 222. 270: (synods in 231 and 232), 228; (— in 321), 314; (— in 362) 327. 333; (— in 399 and 400), 340; (— in 430), 352.
Alexandrine Gnostics, 161.
Alexandrine Jews, 27.
Alogi, 202.
Altare, 133.
Ambrosiaster, 108. 335.
Ambrose, bishop, 250. 267. 290. 293. 305. 334. 372.
Ambrose, a Gnostic, 227.
Ammonius, eremite, 287.
Ammonius Saccas, 99. 227.
Anacletus, of Rome, 72.
Ananias, 56.
Ananus, 66.
'Αναφορὰ Πιλάτου, 40.
Anastasius, bishop, 339.
Anastasius, Roman presbyter, 12.
Anastasius, Constantinople presbyter, 351.
Anastasius, emperor, 362.
'Αναϑήματα, 304.
Anchorites, 130. 289.
Ancyra (council in 314), 269; (— in 358), 325.
Andrew, the apostle, 47. 49.
Angels, fall of, 2.
Anicetus, 137.
Anomoeans, 324.
Anthimus, 365.
Anthusa, 284. 340.
Antichiliasts, 196.
Antidicomarianites, 305.
Antioch (spread of Christianity), 57. 70; (persecution), 97; (sedes apostolica), 117; (patriarchate), 273; (synods in 264 and 269), 200; (school), 237. 270. 348; (council in 341), 270. 320; (— in 345), 322; — (in 378), 331.
Antiochian-Meletian dissension, 327. 331.
Antitactes, 179.
Antitrinitarians, 198. 310.
Antoninus Pius, 86.
Antony, 130. 285.
Apelles, 182.
Aphthardocetae, 364.

Apocatastasis 231.
Apocryphal Gospels, 40.
Apollinaris (Claudius), 103. 137.
Apollinaris, of Laodicea, 347.
Apollonius, martyr, 89.
Apollonius, of Tyana, 90. 101.
Apollos, 60.
Apostles, 46. 107.
Apostles' convention, 58. 65.
Apostles' creed, 140.
Apostolica sedes, 117.
Apostolical Fathers, 148. 210.
Apostolici vicarii, 275.
Aquila, 60.
Arabia (Christianity there), 72. 254.
Arausio (council of), 397.
Arcadius, 266.
Archdeacon, 268.
Archelaus, ethnarch, 24.
Archelaus, of Cascar, 186.
Arch-heretics, 152.
'Αρχιμανδρίτης, 289.
Arians, 346. Arian controversy, 310.
Arianism, 310. 317.
Ariminum (council), 325.
Aristides, 103.
Arius, 223. 313. 319
Arles (synod in 314), 280. 299 (— in 353). 322; (— in 472), 395.
Armenia (spread of Christianity there), 71. 254; (Monophysitism), 370.
Arnobius, 104. 249.
Arnobius the younger, 395.
Artemon, 202. 205.
Artemonites, 202.
Ascension, feast of, 299.
Ascetae, 130.
Ascidas, 366.
Ascusnages, 364.
Ashebetus, 254.
Asia (spread of Christianity there), 70. 252.
Asia-Minor, churches of, 216 sq.
Asterius, 314.
Asylum (church edifice), 266.
Athanasian creed, 329.
Athanasius, 249. 257. 290. 315. 317 sq. 328. 336. 347. 349.
Athenagoras, 103. 196. 223.
Atrium, 296.
Attalus, a martyr, 87.
Audians, the, 400.
Audientes, 122 139; (Manichaean), 190.
Audius (Udo), 400.
Augustine, 250. 271. 276. 282. 290. 293. 301. 350. 372. 386. 391.
Aurelian, 93. 200.
Aurelius (Marcus), 86. 99.
Aurelius, bishop, 385.
Auxentius, 334.
Avitus, 259.
Axid, 281.
Azades, 252.

Babaeus, 356.
Baluzius, 17.
Baptism, 139 sq. 301 sq.
Baptistery, 296.
Baradaeus, 370.
Barbatianus, 293.
Barcochba, 79.
Bardesanes, 71. 172.
Barnabas, 56. 210.
Baronius, 16.
Barsumas, 355.
Bartholomew, the apostle, 47. 72.
Basilides, 166.
Basilideans, 168.
Basiliscus, 361.
Basil the Great, 288. 330.
Basil, of Ancyra, 324.
Basnage, James, 15.
Basnage, Samuel, 15.
Baumgarten, 13.
Baumgarten-Crusius, 9.
Baur, 9. 15. 48. 101.
Bede, 11. 39.
Βῆμα, 190.
Benedict, of Nursia, 291.
Benedictine order, 291.
Benjamin, a Persian deacon, 253.
Benignus, 261.
Beryl, 199. 206.
Bishop, 107. 111. 268. 271.
Blandina, 88.
Blondel, 15.
Boëthius, 363.
Boniface, a general, 374.
Bonosus, 292. 305.
Bracara, Braga (council in 563), 403.
Britain (spread of Christianity there), 73. 260.
Buddas, 186.
Buddeus, 13.
Burdigala (synod), 402.
Burgundians (Christianized), 259.
Bzovius, 16.

Caecilianus, 278.
Caecilius. See Cyprianus.
Caesar-Augusta (synod), 401.
Caesarius, of Arles, 259. 397.
Caius. See Gaius.
Cainites, 175.
Calixt, George, 13.
Canon of N. T., 146.
Canones Apostolici, 212.
Cantatores, 294.
Cappadocia (persecution), 97.
Caracalla, 90.

Carpocrates, 178. Carpocratians, 178.
Carthage (Christianity there), 74; (bishopric), 273; (councils in 255 and 256), 142; (assembly in 311), 278; (episcopal decision in 314), 280; (collatio cum Donatistis), 282; (council in 397), 374; (— in 412), 385; (— in 416), 386; (synod in 417, and general synod in 418), 387.
Cassian, John, 290. 392.
Cassiodorus, 11. 291. 381.
Cataphrygians, 193.
Catechetical school at Alexandria, 222.
Catechists, 139.
Catechumens, 130 190. 301.
Cathedra Petri, 120. 274.
Catholicus (of Nestorians), 356; (of Armenians), 370.
Catholic church, 118.
Celibacy, laws concerning, 269.
Celsus, 99.
Centuriae Magdeburgenses, 13.
Cerdo, 180.
Cerinthus, 165. 195.
Chalcedon, 273 276. 359. 342.
Chaldean-Christians, 356.
Χαρτοφύλακες, 268.
Charlemagne, 39.
Chiliasm, 195—197.
Chlotilda, 260.
Χωρεπίσκοποι, 116. 272.
Χορός (Choir), 296.
Chosroës, 370.
Χρίσμα, 142.
Christ, 2. 30 sq.
Christianity, religio licita, 93.
Χριστιανοί, 57.
Christmas, 138. 299.
Chrysaphius, 358.
Chrysostom, 259 267. 271. 284. 303. 340. 372.
Church, the, 1 sq 30 sq. 43 sq. 118 sq. 121 sq.; (constitution of), 106 sq.; (discipline of), 121 sq.; (music of), 132. 294; (edifices), 295.
Circumcelliones, 281.
Claudius, emperor, 52. 82.
Clement, of Alexandria, 39. 104 sq. 149. 196. 223 226. 312. 372.
Clement, of Rome, 72. 196. 211.
Clementina, 212.
Clergy, the, 111 sq.
Cletus. See Anacletus.
Clovis, 260.
Coelestinus, of Rome, 351. 393.
Coelestius, 384.
Coelicolae, 404.
Coenobia, 289.
Coenobites, 289.
Collyridianians, 304.
Colossians, Paul's epistle to, 62.
Columba, 262.
Commodus, 89.
Communion, 143. 302.
Compresbyterorum collegium, 112.
Confessores, 114.
Confirmatio, 142.
Consecratio, 143. 302.
Consistentes, 123.
Constans, 243. 281. 319.
Constantia, 317.
Constantine the Great, 239 sq. 263. 273 280. 297. 305. 314. 319.
Constantine II., 243.
Constantinople (assembly in 335), 319 (oecumenical council in 381), 273: 331 (council in 448), 358; (— in 536), 365; (— in 541), 366; (— in 548), 367; (conc. oecum. in 553), 368; (patriarchate), 273.
Constantius Chlorus, 94. 97. 239.
Constantius, 243. 281. 319 325.
Constitutiones Apostolici, 108. 212.
Constitutum, 368.
Continentes, 130.
Copts, 74.
Coracion, 196.
Corinth (sedes apostolica), 117.
Corinthians, Paul's epistle to, 61.
Cornelius, the centurion, 51.
Cornelius, a bishop, 92 125.
Cosmas Indicopleustes, 256.
Country bishops. See Χωρεπίσκοποι.
Creation, church doctrine of, 183.
Crescens, 215.
Crispus, 243. 249.
Cross, sign of, 297.
Cubricus, 186.
Cyprian, 93. 119 sq. 142. 148. 221. 372.
Cyprus, 274.
Cyrene (spread of Chrisrianity there), 74.
Cyril, of Alexandria, 250. 350. 355.
Cyril, of Jerusalem, 301. 333.

Daisan, El, 172.
Damascus, 270. 337.
Damianus, 364.
Damianites, 364
Decius, 91.
Demetrius, of Alexandria, 227.
Demophilus, 331.
Deacons, 109. 268.
Deaconesses, 110. 268.
Dhu-Nowas, 255.
Dictinnius, 403.
Didymus, of Alexandria, 223. 333.
Didymus Caecus, 333.
Diocletian, 94.
Diodorus, 348.
Dionysius Exiguus, 39. 277. 299.

Dionysius Areopagita, 214.
Dionysius, of Alexandria, 92. 125. 143. 196 201. 207. 234. 311.
Dionysius, of Paris, 73
Dionysius, of Rome, 207. 235. 311.
Dioscurus, a monk, 340.
Dioscurus, a patriarch, 357.
Diospolis (synod), 386.
Docetae 163. 345.
Domitian, 83.
Donatist schism, 278. 375.
Donatus Magnus, 279. 281.
Donatus, of Casa Nigra, 279.
Dorotheus. 237.
Dositheus, 153.
Du Fresne (Du Cange), 7.
Du Pin, 8.

Easter (festival), 136. 297); (controversy), 136; (vigils), 139. 298.
East-Goths, 259. 335.
East-India, 71. 256.
Ebionites, 155. 201; (gospel of), 157.
Edessa (spread of Christianity), 71; (school), 270. 355.
Egypt (Christianity there), 73; (persecution there), 96; (Monophysites), 361. 369.
Elcesaites, 156
Elders, *πρεσβύτεροι*, 107.
Electi (Manichaean perfecti,*τέλειοι*),190.
Eleutherus, 73. 192.
Elvira (synod), 134. 139. 269.
Elxai, 157.
Emanation-doctrine, 160.
Encratites, 177.
Ἐνεργούμενοι, 115.
England (spread of Christianity), 260.
Enthusiasts, 288.
Ephesians, Paul's epistle to, 62.
Ephesus (sedes apost.), 117; (conc. oec. 431), 352 388; (council in 449), 358.
Ephraem, the Syrian, 335.
Epiphanes, 178.
Epiphany, feast of, 138 300.
Epiphanius, of Salamis, 155. 202. 296. 305. 336. 338. 342.
Epiphanius Scholasticus, 11.
Episcopate, 111. 120. 271.
Ἐπίσκοποι, 107. 268.
Epistolae formatae, 118.
Epistolae Pilati, 41.
Ertenki-Mani, 187.
Essenes, 25.
Ethiopia. See Abyssinia.
Εὐαγγελισταί, 109.
Euchites, 288.
Eudocia, 358.
Eudoxia, 341.
Eulogius, of Caesarea, 386.
Eunapius, 248.
Eunomius, 324.
Euphemites, 404.
Europe (spread of Christianity), 72. 258.
Eusebius (Pamphili), of Caesarea, 10. 239 249. 296 314. 317. 320. 336.
Eusebius, of Dorylaeum, 357.
Eusebius, of Emesa, 327.
Eusebius, of Nicomedia, 242. 314. 316.
Eusebius, of Vercelli, 328.
Eusebius, a monk, 340.
Eustathius, 288—327.
Eustathians, 327.
Euthymius, a monk, 254—340.
Eutropius, 266. 341.
Eutyches, 357.
Eutychius, 12.
Eutychian controversy, 356 sq.
Evagrius, 11.
Evangelists, 109.
Evangelium infant. Servatoris, 42.
Evangelium Thomae, 41.
Evangelium de Nativitate Mariae, 42.
Evangelium Nicodemi, 41.
Ἔξαρχοι, 273.
Excommunicatio, 122.
Exorcism, 115.
Exorcistae, 115.

Fabricius, a historian, 13.
Facundus, 367.
Fasir, 281.
Faustus, of Rhegium, 259. 290. 396.
Faustus, the Manichaean, 400.
Felicissimus, 124.
Felicitas, a martyr, 90.
Felix, the procurator, 62.
Felix, of Aptunga, 278.
Felix II., of Rome, 362.
Festivals, annual, 136.
Festus, the procurator, 62.
Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea, 121. 143.
Flacius (Illyricus), 12.
Flavianus, of Antioch, 332.
Flavianus, of Constantinople, 358.
Flentes, 122.
Fleury (Claude), [illegible]
Florentius, a priest, 291.
Fortunatus, a bishop, 124.
Franks (Christianized), 259.
Friday (day of fasting, prayer, etc.), 135.
Frumentius. 257.
Fulgentius Ferrandus, 367.
Fulgentius, of Ruspe, 396.
Fuller, Peter, 363.

Gaius, a presbyter, 196.
Galatians, Paul's epistle to, 60.
Galerius. 94. 98. 238.
Gallienus, 93.

Gallus, emperor. 92.
Gangra (synod), 288. 292.
Gaul (spread of Christianity), 73. 259.
Gemara, 102.
General councils, 277.
Gennadius, of Marseilles, 396.
Genuflectentes. 123. 302.
Georgius, of Alexandria, 323. 327.
Georgius, of Laodicea, 324.
Germany (Christianity in), 73.
Gibbon, 16.
Gieseler, 15.
Gildas, 262.
Γνῶσις, 158.
Gnosticism, 148. 158.
Gnostics, 157; (Syrian and Alexandrian), 161, (Gnostic-Manichaean sects). 400.
Gordian, 90.
Goths (Christianized), 258.
Gratian, emperor, 246. 328. 402.
Gregory Illuminator, 254.
Gregory Nazianzen, 330. 336.
Gregory Nyssa, 330. 332. 336.
Gregory Thaumaturgus, 123. 236.
Gregory, of Alexandria, 319.
Gregory, of Tours, 11.
Guhsciatazades, 252.
Gundobald, 260.
Gustasp, 105.

Hadrian, emperor, 85.
Harmonius, 172.
Haymo, 12.
Hebrews, epistle to, 64.
Hebrews, gospel of, 157.
Hegesippus, 10.
Helena, 305.
Heliogabalus, 90.
Helvidius, 305.
Henke, 14.
Henoticon, 362.
Heraclas, 223.
Heracleon, 171.
Hermas, 211.
Hermes Trismegistus, 105.
Hermogenes, 183
Herod, 24. 35.
Herod Agrippa I., 24.
Herod Agrippa II., 24.
Herod Antipas, 24. 35.
Heros, of Arles, 386.
Hierocles, 101.
Hilarion, 254. 287.
Hilary, of Arles, 275.
Hilary, of Poictiers, 294. 322. 372.
Hilary, a Gaul, 393
Himerius, 302.
Hippo Regius (council), 147. 273. 303.
Hippolytus, 199. 217.
Historia de Nativit. Mariae, 42.
Homoeousians, 324.
Honorius, emperor, 387.
Hormisdas, emperor, 387.
Hormisdas, of Rome, 396.
Hormisdas (Hormuz), of Persia, 187.
Hosius, 314. 325.
Hydroparastates, 177.
Hyginus, bishop of Cordova, 401.
Hypsistarians, 403.
Hystaspes. See Gustasp.

Ibas, 355. 367.
Iberians (Christianized), 256.
Idacius, of Merida, 401.
Ignatius, of Antioch, 85. 113. 196. 213.
Illus, 362.
Images, 133. 296.
India (spread of Christianity in), 71.
Indulgentia (Manichaean), 190.
Infant baptism, 140 sq. 301 sq.
Innocent I., of Rome, 275. 344. 386
Instantius, 401.
Intercessio episcoporum, 266.
Irenaeus, 73. 76. 120. 138. 146. 195. 205. 216. 311.
Ireland (Christianity in), 260
Irish cloisters, 262.
Isidore, a Gnostic, 166.
Isidore, of Pelusium, 289. 352. 389.
Isidore, of Alexandria, 340.
Ithacius, 401.

Jacob Baradaeus, 370.
Jacobites, 370.
Jacobus, a Persian, 253.
James the Elder, 47. 78.
James the Younger, 46. 58. 64. 70. 78.
Jazelich (Catholicus). 356.
Jerome, 276. 290. 293. 305. 337. 386.
Jerusalem (apostle's convention). 58. 65; (spread of Christianity thence), 70; (destruction of), 78; (synod in 415), 386.
Jesus Christ, 2. 30 sq. 34 sq.
Jewish Theology, 24.
Jewish War, 79.
Jews, (religion of), 23; (Judaism after Christ), 77; (persecutions by Jews), 78.
Jezdegerdes I, 253.
Johannites, 343.
John, the Apostle, 46. 50. 66. 204.
John, the Baptist, 32. 36.
John, of Antioch, 351.
John, of Jerusalem, 338. 386.
John. Chrysostom. See Chrysostom.
John Scholasticus. 277.
John Talaya, 362.
Josephus, 26. 40.

Jovian, 246. 328.
Jovinianus, 293.
Judaea, political rulers of, 24.
Judas, of Gamala (Galilaeus), 24.
Judas (Lebbaeus, Thaddeus), 47; (in Arabia), 47.
Judas Iscariot, 47.
Julia Mammaea, 90.
Julianists, 364.
Julian, the emperor, 244. 248. 281. 326. 328.
Julian, of Halicarnassus, 364.
Julian, of Eclanum, 388.
Julius Africanus, 218.
Julius, of Rome, 319.
Justina, 334.
Justinian I, 363. 365.
Justin Martyr, 76. 103. 131. 143. 149. 152. 195. 215.
Justin I., 363.
Justin II., 369.

Κιγκλίδες (cancelli), 296.
Kiss of brotherhood, 128.
Κλῆρος (κληρικός), 111.
Κοιμητήρια (dormitoria), 133.
Κοπιᾶται (Fossarii), 268.
Κρήνη (canthurus), 296.
Ktistolatrae, 364

Labarum, 240.
Lactantius, 195. 239. 249.
Laderchius, 16.
Laity (λαός), 113.
Laodicea (council), 297. 303.
Lapsi, 92.
Λαῦραι, 289.
Laurentius Valla, 12.
Lazarus, of Aix, 386.
Lazians (Christianized), 257.
Lectores, 115.
Legio Fulminea, 88.
Leo the Great, 274. 358. 388. 395.
Leo I., emperor, 361.
Leonidas, father of Origen, 227.
Leporius, a monk, 350.
Libanius, 244. 248.
Libellatici, 92.
Libelli paschales, 299.
Liberatus, 369.
Liberius, 322.
Licinius, 241 sq.
Linus, 72.
Liturgy, 294.
Lombards (Arians), 335.
Luke, the Evangelist, 10. 59.
Lucian, of Antioch, 237.
Lucian, of Samosata, 99.
Lucidus, 395.
Lucifer, of Calaris, 327, 328 sq.
Luciferians, 327.
Lucilla, 278.
Lucius, a British king, 73.
Lucius, a martyr, 92.
Lutheran Church Historians, 12 sq.
Lyons, Lugdunum, (church there), 73; (persecution there), 87; (council in 475), 395.

Mabillon, 7.
Macedonians, 332.
Macedonius, 332.
Macrianus, 92.
Magdeburg Centuries, 13.
Magicians, 22. 81.
Magistri (Manichaean), 190.
Magnentius, 320.
Majorinus, 279.
Malabar (church in), 256.
Malchion, a presbyter, 200.
Mamertus, 396.
Mani (Manes, Manichaeus), 186 sq.
Manichaeans, 71. 94. 185 sq.
Manichaean-Gnostics, 400.
Mansi, 5. 16.
Mar Thomas, 356.
Marcellinus, 282.
Marcellus, 321. 346.
Marcia, 89.
Marcianus, 359.
Marcion and his school, 180.
Marcus, a Gnostic, 172.
Mark, the Evangelist, 53. 59. 74.
Mary, the Virgin (her history), 34. 41 (veneration of), 304.
Maris, 355.
Marius Mercator, 351.
Marriage (Christian), 145; (of clergy), 269.
Martin, of Tours, 260. 290. 402.
Martyrs (natalitia martyrum), 138; (veneration of), 303 sq.
Maruthas, 253.
Mass, the, 295.
Massiliensians, 391.
Maternus, 249.
Matthew, the Apostle, 47; (to Ethiopia, 47.
Matthias, the Apostle, 47.
Mauritania, 74.
Maxentius, 98. 239.
Maximianus, a deacon, 281.
Maximilla, 192.
Maximin, the Thracian, 90.
Maximin, 98. 238. 239. 286
Maximus, the usurper, 402.
Mayilapur, 71. 256.
Melchiades (Miltiades), 280.
Meletians, 328.
Meletian schism (in Egypt), 125; (in Antioch), 327, 332.
Meletius, of Lycopolis, 126.

Meletius, of Mopsuestia, 354.
Meletius, of Sebaste, 327.
Melito, of Sardis, 86. 103. 137.
Memnon, of Ephesus, 353.
Menander, 153.
Mennas, a patriarch, 366.
Mensurius, of Carthage, 278.
Meropius, 257.
Mesopotamia (Christianity there), 71; (persecution), 97; (Monophysites), 370.
Messalians, 288.
Messiah. Old Testament idea of, 31.
Methodius, of Tyre, 195. 236.
Metropolitanate, 117. 272.
Miesrob, 254.
Milan (synod), 322.
Mileve (synod), 386.
Miltiades. See Melchiades.
Minucius Felix, 104.
Minucius Fundanus, 85.
Mishna, 102.
Missa catechumenorum, 294.
Missa fidelium, 295.
Möhler, 9. 18.
Monachism, 285 sq.
Monarchians, 198 sq.
Μονάς (Gnostic), 178.
Monasteria, 288.
Mongus, 361.
Monica, 284. 372. 373.
Monophysites, 369.
Monophysite controversy, 360.
Montanists, 191.
Montanus, 192.
Moses, 1.
Moses, a monk, 254.
Moses, of Chorene, 254.
Mosheim, 13.

Νάρθηξ, ferula, 296.
Natalis, 202.
Natalis (Noël). 17.
Natalitia Martyrum. See Martyrs.
Navis (*ναῦς ἐκκλησίας*), 296.
Nazarenes, 155; (gospel of), 157.
Neander, 14.
Neo-Caesarea (council), 269.
Nepos, of Arsinoe, 196.
Nero, 82.
Nerva, 82.
Nestorius, 350. 388.
Nestorians, 356.
Nestorian controversy, 350.
New-Platonists, 99. 100. 101. 159. 244. 247.
Nice (concil. oecum. in 325), 270. 272. 276. 299. 314 sq.
Nicene symbol, 119. 315.
Nicephorus Callisti, 12.
Nicolaitans, 179.
Nicolaus, 180.
Nilus, 289.
Niobes, 364.
Niobites, 364.
Nisibis (school there), 270.
Noëtus, 199. 205.
Nonna, 284.
North-African church, 218.
Notarii, 268.
Novatian, 123. 124.
Novatus, 124.
Novi, 298.
Numia, 256.
Numidia, 74.
Nynia, 262.

Oblatio pro mortuis, 303.
Odoacer, 251.
Oecumenical councils, 264. 277.
Οἰκονόμοι, 268.
Ophites, 173.
Optatus, 278.
Orange (council), 110.
Orange (Arausio), council of, 397.
Ordination, 111. 280.
Ordines majores, 115.
Ordines minores, 115.
Origen, 104. 121 155 196 199. 206. 223. 227. 308. 312. 336. 345.
Origenistic school, 222; (in Alexandria), 234; (in Caesarea), 236.
Origenistic controversies, 336. 365.
Orosius, 250, 386.
Ostiarii, 115.

Pachomius, 287.
Pagi, 16.
Palladius, bishop, 285. 341.
Pamphilus, 236.
Pantaenus, 72. 223. 225.
Paphnutius, 269.
Papias, 149. 195. 214.
Parabolani, 268.
Παράδοσις ἀποστολική, 139.
Παρασκευή, 136. 298.
Paris (church), 73.
Παρθένοι, 130.
Πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον, 136. 298.
Πάσχα σταυρώσιμον, 136. 298.
Patmos, 68.
Patriarchate, 272.
Patricius, 261.
Patripassians, 197. 205.
Paul, the Apostle, 48. 51. 54 sq. 70. 72. 155. 254. 304
Paul, of Thebes, 130. 285.
Paul, of Samosata, 200. 207. 321.
Paulians, 200.
Pauline party at Corinth, 60.

Paulinus of Milan, 385.
Paulinus, a Eustathian, 328. 331.
Pax, 122.
Pelagian controversy, 384 sq.
Pelagius, the British monk, 381.
Pelagius, of Rome, 366. 368.
Pella, 79, 154.
Penance, 121 sq.
Pentecost, 138. 299.
Pepuzians, 193
Perfecti (Manichaean), 190.
Περιοδευταί (Visitatores), 272.
Perpetua, a martyr, 90.
Persecutions, 77 sq. 238 sq.
Persia (Christianity there), 71. 252.
Persian church, 356.
Petavius, 17.
Peter, the Fuller, 363.
Peter, the Apostle, 46. 49 sq. 70 sq. 304.
Peter (Ashebetus), 254.
Peter Martyr, at Alexandria, 223.
Peter, a martyr, 96.
Peter, of Alexandria, 123.
Peter, of Jerusalem, 366.
Phantasiasts, 364.
Pharisees, 25.
Phasitla, 370.
Philastrius, 334.
Phileas, 96. 126.
Philemon, Paul's epistle to, 62.
Philippians, epistle to, 52
Philippopolis (council), 320.
Philip, the Apostle, 47.
Philip, the Arabian, 90. 91.
Philip, a deacon, 50. 110. 152.
Philip, a tetrarch, 24.
Philippus Sidetes, 223.
Philo, 27. 28.
Philoponus, 364.
Philoponiaci, 364.
Philostratus, 101.
Philostorgius, 10.
Philoxenus, 363.
Photinus, 321 346.
Φωτιζόμενοι, 302.
Phrygia (persecution in), 97.
Phthartolatrae, 364.
Phusik, 252.
Picts, 260.
Pierius, 223.
Pilate, 24. 38.
Pilgrimages, 305.
Planck, 8. 14.
Platonism, 22 27. 159. 215. 344.
Pliny, 84.
Plotinus, 99.
Πνευματικοί, 162. 170. 189.
Πνευματομάχοι, 333.
Poenitentes, 122.
Poenitentia, grades of, 122.
Polycarp, of Smyrna, 87. 137. 196. 213.
Polycrates, of Ephesus, 137.
Polytheism, 1.
Ponticus, a martyr, 88.
Pontius, a deacon, 221.
Pontus (persecution), 97.
Porphyry, 100.
Posidius, Posidonius, 376.
Potamiäna, 90.
Pothinus, 88. 217.
Praxeas, 199. 205.
Predestinationists, 395.
Πρεσβύτεροι, 107 sq
Princeps (of the Manichaeans), 190.
Priscilla, 192.
Priscillian, 401.
Priscillianists, 402.
Proclus, a presbyter, 351.
Proculus, a Montanist, 196.
Prodicians, 179.
Prodicus, 179.
Πρόναος, 296.
Proselytes to Judaism, 29.
Prosper, 393.
Proterius, 361.
Protevangelium Jacobi, 40.
Provincial synods, 117.
Prudentius, a poet, 250.
Pseudo-Basilideans, 168. 179.
Pseudo Clementines, 212.
Ψυχικοί, 162. 170. 190.
Ptolemaeus, a Gnostic, 172.
Pulcheria, 359.
Pulpitum, 133.

Quadrigesimal fast, 136. 297.
Quadratus, 103.
Quartodecimani, 299.

Rabulas, 355.
Reccared, 259.
Recognitiones Clementis, 212.
Reconciliatio, 122.
Remigius, of Rheims, 260.
Reformed Church historians, 15 sq.
Rhetorians, 403.
Rhodon, 233.
Rimini, Ariminum, (council), 325.
Romans, Paul's epistle to, 61.
Rome (Christianity there). 53. 72; (sedes apostolica), 117; (metropolis), 273; (episcopal decision against the Donatists), 280; (synod in 430), 351.
Roman Catholic Church historians, 16 sq.
Rufinus, Toranius, 11. 12. 239. 338
Rufinus, a minister, 342.

Sabbath, 134; (laws concerning), 265.
Sabellians, 201.
Sabellius, 201. 207.

Sacraments, 139. 301.
Sacrifice (in the Supper), 144. 303.
Sacrificati, 92.
Sadducees, 25.
Saints, veneration of, 303.
Salvianus, a presbyter, 250.
Salvianus, a bishop, 401.
Samaria (Peter there). 50; (spread of Christianity there), 50. 71.
Samosatenians, 200.
Sanctus, 87.
Sapores I. of Persia, 187.
Sapores II, 252.
Sarabaites, 290.
Sardica (council), 269. 272. 320.
Sarpi, 17.
Saturday (Jewish Sabbath), 135.
Saturninus, a Gnostic, 175.
Saturninus, of Toulouse, 73.
Schwegler, 191.
Schisms, 123.
Scholasticus. See John Scholasticus.
Scotland (missions there), 262.
Scots. 260.
Schröckh, 14
Scythianus, 186.
Scythian monks, 365. 396.
Secundus, 279. 316.
Sedes apostolica, 117.
Seleucia (council), 325.
Semi-Arians, 312.
Semijejunia, 136
Semi-Pelagians, 391.
Semi-Pelagian controversy, 390.
Semler, 13. 217.
Seneca, 388.
Seniores plebis, 114.
Serapis, image of, 247.
Serapion, a bishop, 239. 332.
Serennius Granianus, 85.
Sethians, 175.
Severa, 91.
Severians, 364.
Severus (Septimius), 89.
Severus (Sulpicius). 11.
Severus, an Encratite, 178.
Severus, of Antioch, 363.
Sibylline books, 105.
Silas, 59.
Simeon (Luke i ii.), 32.
Simeon, of Jerusalem, 85.
Simeon, of Seleucia, 252.
Simon Magus, 52 152.
Simon, the Canaanite, 47.
Simonians, 153.
Simony, 153.
Siricius, bishop of Rome, 269. 277. 293. 302. 305. 402.
Sirmium (council in 351), 321; (— in 357), 325; (— in 359), 325.
Sixtus, of Rome, 93.
Sixtus III., of Rome, 261.
Slaves, regulations concerning, 267.
Smyrna (persecution there), 87.
Socrates, the historian, 10.
Sozomenus, the historian, 10.
Spain (Paul there), 63; (Christianity there), 73; (Gnostic-Manichaeans there), 401.
Sponsores, 141.
Stephen, the martyr, 50. 55. 78. 110. 304
Stephen, bishop of Rome, 121. 142.
Stephanus Niobes, 364.
Stoicism, 22.
Studites, 290.
Studius, Studium, 290.
Stylites, the, 289.
Stylites (Simeon), 289.
Subdiaconi, 115.
Subintroductae, 130.
Substrati, 123.
Suggestus (pulpitum), 133.
Sulpicius Severus. See Severus.
Sunday, 135. 265. 297.
Supper (sacramental), 143 sq. 302.
Symbolum Apostolicum, 139. 140.
Symbolum Aquileiense, 140.
Symbolum Athanasianum, 329.
Symbolum Chalcedonense, 360.
Symbolum Nicaenum, 315.
Symbolum Orientale, 140.
Symbolum Romanum, 140.
Symmachus, 248. 250.
Synesius, 344.
Synods, 117.
Synodus ad Quercum, 342.
Σύνϑρονοι, 296.
Syria (Monophysites there), 363. 370.
Syrian Gnostics, 161.

Talaya, 362.
Talmud, 102.
Tatian, 103. 177.
Terebinthus, 186.
Tertullian, 73. 104. 127 sq. 142 sq. 146. 183. 192. 194. 195. 199. 205. 219 sq. 311. 336. 345. 372.
Thaddeus, 71.
Themistians, 364.
Themistius, an orator, 247.
Themistius, a deacon, 364.
Theoctistus, of Caesarea, 228.
Theodora, Justinian's consort, 365.
Theodore, of Mopsuestia, 348. 366. 389.
Theodoret, 10. 250. 276 349. 352. 354. 367.
Theodorus, a lector, 11.
Theodorus Ascidas, 366.
Theodosius the Great, 246. 267. 331.
Theodotus, a tanner, 201. 205.

Theognis, 316.
Theognistus, 402.
Theological controversies (influence of), 306 sq.
Theonas, 316.
Theophilus, of Alexandria, 338 sq. 350.
Theophilus, of Antioch, 103.
Theophilus, the Indian, 254. 256. 257.
Therapeutae, 26. 404.
Thessalonians, Paul's epistles to, 59.
Thiven (synod), 370.
Thomas, the Apostle, 47; (to Parthia), 47; (in Persia), 71.
Thomas Barsumas, 355.
Three Chapters, controversy of the, 366.
Θρόνος ἐπισκόπου, 296.
Thurificati, 92.
Tiberius, 81.
Tichonius, 281.
Tillemont, 17.
Timothy (Paul's pupil), 59. 107; (Paul's epistles to), 63. 64
Timotheus Ailurus, 361.
Timotheus Salophacialus, 361.
Tiridates, 254.
Titus, 59; (Paul's epistle to), 63.
Titus, of Bostra, 185.
Titus, the emperor, 78.
Toledo (synod in 589), 259.
Tolpiacum (battle of), 260.
Tongues, speaking with, 44.
Toulouse (Saturninus there), 73.
Tübingen school, 48 sq. 191.
Traditores, 95.
Trajan, 84.
Trinity (controversies), 197 sq. 310 sq.; (development of the doctrine), 202 sq. See Anti-Trinitarians.
Tyre (synod), 318.

Ulphilas, 258.
Ulpianus, 90.
Ὑποδιάκονοι. See Subdiaconi.
Ursacius, 324.

Valence (synod in 529), 398.
Valens, the emperor, 246 287. 328.
Valens, bishop of Mursa, 325.
Valentinians, 171.
Valentinus, the Gnostic, 169 sq.; (school of), 171.
Valentinianus I., the emperor, 246. 265. 328 400.
Valentinianus II., 246. 328. 334.
Valentinianus III., 275.
Valerian, the emperor, 92.
Valerius, bishop of Carthage, 374.
Valla, 12.
Vandals, 335. 374.
Varanes I., of Persia, 187.
Varanes V., of Persia, 253.
Victor, of Rome, 137. 202.
Victor Vitensis, 335.
Vienne (Christianity there), 73; (persecution there), 87.
Vigilantius, 293. 304.
Vigiliae, 139.
Vigilius, of Rome, 367.
Vigilius, of Tapsus, 329.
Vincent, of Lerins, 290. 393.
Visitatores, 272.
Vitalianus, 363.
Vulgate, 337.

Wednesday (dies stationum), 135.
Weismann, a historian, 13.
West Goths (Christianized), 258. 335.

Xenayas (Philoxenus), 363.

Zacharias (Luke i.), 32.
Zanzalus. See Baradaeus.
Zeno Isauricus, 361.
Zenobia, 200.
Zosimus, a historian, 248.
Zosimus, bishop of Rome, 276. 387.

QUESTIONS.

INTRODUCTION.

§§ 1—16.

(§ 1.) Effect of apostasy upon man's idea of the Deity? Remedy employed? Two principal features of the Old Testament revelation? Personage in whom the Old Testament revelation was fulfilled? Definition of the Christian Church? Distinction between the visible and invisible Church? Two eras in Universal History? Revolutions in the second era? Five stages in the History of Redemption? (§ 2.) Definition of Church History? Problem of Church History? Method of Church History? Three principal divisions in Church History, and their denominations? Guericke's seven periods? Distribution of the materials in each period? (§ 3.) Definition of "sources"? Immediate sources? Mediate sources? (§ 4.) General auxiliary sciences? Special auxiliary sciences? (§ 5.) Definition of coördinate branches? Six coördinate branches? Improper limitation of the term "Archæology"? Definition of the "History of Opinions"? Definition of Symbolism? (§ 6) Earliest source for the history of the Christian Church? Principal Greek Historians? Their characteristics? Principal Latin Historians? Their characteristics? Principal Mediæval Historians? Principal Lutheran Historians? Principal Reformed Historians? Principal Roman Catholic Historians?

FOUNDING OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

§§ 7—17.

(§ 7.) Source of man's religious ideas? Amount of restraining power in them? Basis of the popular Pagan religions? State of religion among the cultivated at the Advent? Among the masses? Prevalent philosophy among the masses? Philosophers' conception of God? Causes and results of the religious reäction that occurred? General religious condition of the Pagan populations at the Advent? Two best philosophical systems? Moral influence of each? Fatal defect in Platonism? Popular estimate of Platonism? Final issue of the Platonic Eclecticism? (§ 8.) Distinctive difference between Judaism and Heathenism? Original and intrinsic nature of Judaism? Nature of pseudo-Judaism? Moral condition of the Jewish nation? Political history of Judea at the time of the Advent? State of Jewish theology? Characteristics of the Pharisees? Of the Sadducees? Of the Essenes? Characteristics of the Alexandrine Jews? Two classes of idealists among them? Their representative? (§ 9.) Is Christianity explicable as a development of any of the religions existing at the time of the Advent? How was this sunken condition of mankind a preparation for Christianity? Facilities for the spread of the Christian religion? Instrumentality of the Jews in it? Difference in the attitude of the two classes of proselytes? (§ 10) What need in human nature corresponding to the Person and Work of Christ? Explain this subjective need of Redemption? Form in which the feeling exists in Paganism? In what form does it exist in Judaism? Jewish misconception of the Messiah? Defect in the first Christian believers? Christ's own enunciation of the idea of the Messiah? Characteristics of Christ's Person? Relation of his miracles to his Person? Four chief events in Christ's history? First effect upon apostate man of Christ's teachings and example? Christ's chief function? Purpose of his death? Relation of Christ's work to that of the Holy Ghost? (§ 11.) Mythical view of Christ? Nature of Christ's birth? How account for the visit of the Magi? Sketch of Christ's childhood? Relation of John Baptist to Christ? Sketch of Christ's manhood and public ministry? Character of the witnesses to Christ's public career? What days have been held to be Christ's birth-day? Variations in respect to Christ's birth-year? Variations in respect to the date of Christ's death? Pretended writings of Christ? Genuine and pretended contemporaneous accounts of Christ? Value of the apocryphal gospels in reference to the canonical? (§ 12.) Event by which the *Christian* Church was established? What intimations had preceded it? Relation of the Pentecostal effusion to previous influences of the Spirit? Time and circumstances of the Pentecostal effusion? Its accompaniments and consequences? Its relation to succeeding influences of the Spirit? Its effect upon the Apostles? Unquestionable meaning of "speaking with tongues," in Acts ii.? Meaning in 1 Cor. xiv.? Comprehensive statement of the nature of this Charism? What text suggests this? (§ 13.) Distinctive function of the Apostles? Leading Apostles? Names of the others? Tradition respecting their tarrying in Jerusalem? Probable field of the labors of the eight less distinguished? Substitute for Iscariot? Validity of Matthew's apostleship? Was Paul a member of the Apostolic College? Theory of the Tübingen school respecting the Apostolic writings? Support for it? (§ 14.) Position of Peter among the Apostles, at first? By whom was he directed to Christ? His feeling toward Christ? Meaning of the "rock"? Deficiencies in his character? Acts evincing his Christian boldness? His first preaching? Second preaching tour? Truth taught to Peter at Cæsarea? Subsequent centre of his labors? Reason for his leaving Jerusalem? When? Difference between Peter and Paul respecting Gentile converts? Subsequent history of Peter? Traditionary notices respecting Peter? Tradition respecting his journey to the East? To Rome in the time of Claudius? Value of Jerome's and Eusebius's statement that Peter was Bishop of Rome twenty-five years? When and where was Peter's first Epistle written? His second Epistle? Evidence for Peter's martyrdom at Rome? (§ 15.) Paul's relation to Peter in the extending of Christianity? His birth and parentage? Early education? His character as formed by his education? His attitude towards the Christians? Manner of his conversion? Proof of its reality? Date of it? Source and ground of Paul's apostleship? His first residence after his conversion? First reception at Jerusalem? Paul's leading idea as an Apostle? His success at Antioch? His second journey to Jerusalem? Paul's first missionary tour? Method of preaching adopted? Composition of the churches planted? Centre of missions at this time? Occasion of Paul's third journey to Jerusalem? Discussion at the Apostle's Convention? Results? How published? Relation, henceforth, of the Jewish-Christian and the Gentile-Christian Churches to each other? Second missionary journey of Paul? Fourth journey to Jerusalem? Third missionary journey of Paul? Time and occasion of Paul's writing to the Galatians? To the Corinthians? To the Romans? Fifth journey to Jerusalem? Reception by the Jews? Journey to Rome and labors there? Epistles written at Rome? Was Paul released from his imprisonment? Labors after his release? Time of his second imprisonment? Martyrdom, when and where? (§ 16.) Birth and parentage of James the Younger? Representative of what tendency? His field of labor? Attitude at the Apostle's Convention? Proof of his doctrinal agreement with Paul? Manner of his death? (§ 17.) Relation of John to Jesus? His birth and parentage? Defect in his early christian character? Final type of his piety? His first preaching and field of labor? His final field of labor? Date of his Gospel? Time of his exile? Date of the Apocalypse? John's attitude towards Cerinthus and the Gnostics? Time and place of his death?

Spread and Limitation of Christianity.

§§ 18—27; 61—68.

(§ 18.) Course of missions in Asia during the first three centuries? In Europe? In Africa? (§ 19.) Hindrances to the first spread of Christianity? Characteristics of the early Christians? Testimonies to continued miraculous power in the Church? (§ 20.) Attitude of true Judaism towards Christianity? Of false Judaism? First effect of the Apostle's preaching? First martyr? First governmental persecution? Siege of Jerusalem? Fortunes of the Christians? Consequences to the Christians of the Jewish revolt? (§ 21.) Three sources of Pagan persecution? Roman theory of religious toleration? Toleration of Judaism in particular? Characteristics in the Christianity of the first Christians unfavorable to its toleration? Feeling of the populace towards the Christians? Individuals' motives for persecuting the Christians? (§ 22.) Describe the persecution under Tiberius. Under Claudius. Under Nero. Under Domitian. Under Nerva. (§ 23.) Persecution under Trajan? Under Hadrian? Under Antoninus Pius? (§ 24.) Persecution under Marcus Aurelius? At Smyrna? At Lyons and Vienne? Occurrence of the "thundering legion"? (§ 25.) Describe the persecution under Commodus. Under Septimius Severus. Under Caracalla. Under Alexander Severus. Under Maximin, Gordian, and Philip. (§ 26) Describe the Decian persecution. Describe the different classes of the Lapsi. Persecution under Gallus? Under Valerian? Important edict of Gallienus favorable to Christianity? Christianity under Aurelian? (§ 27.) Feeling of Diocletian towards Christianity? By whom was he influenced? His first order? His first edict? His second edict? His third edict? Character of the Diocletian persecution? Localities of this persecution? Its results? Cause of the alteration of Galerius's feeling? (§ 61.) Early feeling of Constantine towards Christianity? His later attitude? His motives? First law favorable to Christianity issued by Constantine and Licinius? Contest between Constantine and Licinius? Constantine's measures against heathenism? Constantine's personal character? Course pursued by the successor of Constantine? (§ 62.) Sketch of Julian? His plans for reviving Paganism? His success? His death? (§ 63.) General career of the church after Julian? Heathen called *pagani* — when? Suppression of Idolatry by Theodosius — when and how? Date of the division of the Roman empire? What event signalized the downfall of Paganism in the East? Date of the suppression of open and avowed Paganism? (§ 65.) Causes instrumental to the spread of Christianity outside of the civilized classic world? (§ 66.) Condition of Christianity in Asia, in the second period, viz.: In Persia? In Armenia? In Arabia? In East India? In Iberia? (§ 67.) Condition of Christianity in Africa during the second period? (§ 68.) Course of missions, in the second period among the Goths? Among the Burgundians and Franks? Among the Britons, Picts, and Scots? (§ 28.) Attitude of the Stoic sceptics towards Christianity? Of the Epicurean sceptics? Of the New Platonic sceptics? Founders of the New Platonic school? Aim of this school? Sketch of Celsus and his writings? Of Porphyry and his writings? Of Hierocles and his writings? Of Apollonius of Tyana? Of the Talmud, Mishna, and the Gemaras? Attitude of the Jewish theologians of the first century towards Christianity? (§ 29) The most flourishing period of Christian Apologetics in the first centuries? Two species of Apologies? Mention the earliest Apologists. Sketch of Justin Martyr and his writings? Of Tatian? Of Theophilus? Of Athenagoras? Of Clement of Alexandria? Of Tertullian? Of Minucius Felix? Of Origen? Of Arnobius? Tertullian's Apologetic method? Character of the Stromata of Clement? Spurious Apologies? (§ 64.) The claim of the later Pagan sceptic, compared with that of the earlier, respecting Christianity? Views of Themistius? Of Symmachus? Of Julian? Of Libanius? Of Eunapius and Zosimus? Sketch of the Apologetic writings of Lactantius? Of Eusebius Pamphilus? Of Athanasius? Of Maternus? Of Ambrose, Cyril, and Theodoret? Of Augustine? Of Orosius and Salvianus?

CHURCH POLITY.

§§ 30—34; 69—72.

(§ 30.) The Christian idea of the priesthood? Effect of this theory in reference to a sacerdotal caste? Effect in reference to clerical functions and the distinction between clergy and laity? What exception to the operation of the principle that all Christians are priests? Proof that there was a formal office, and official functions, in the Apostolic Churches? Relation sustained by the Apostles to *all* the Churches? Who had the oversight of the *local* Church? Mention the patristic authorities in support of the assertion that presbyter and bishop were primarily identical? New Testament proofs of this? Duties of the first elder or bishop? Relative importance attached to *teaching*, in the primitive church? New Testament proof of this? Definition of the evangelist? Duties of the primitive deacon? Cases of Philip and Stephen? Mode of choosing church officers in the Apostolic age? Account of the deaconesses? What changes in the constitution of the church after the Apostolic age? Definition of the episcopate? Manner in which the episcopate came into existence? How late are bishop and elder used as equivalent terms? Prerogatives of the bishops in the fourth century? Change in the relation between the clergy and the laity? Polity of the Ignatian Epistles? First meaning of the term κλῆρος? Subsequent meaning? Coöperation of the membership in the election of a clergyman? Who were the seniores plebis? Who were the ordines majores, and ordines minores? (§ 31.) Relation of city and country churches to each other? Prevalence of the chor-episcopate? Relation of the metropolitan church to the other city churches? Relation of the great metropolitan churches to other churches? Origin and influence of the Synods? Origin of letters missive and epistolæ communicatoriæ? (§ 32.) Reasons, in the early ages of the church, for cherishing the doctrine of the visible unity of the church? How early was the doctrine of the "Holy Catholic Church" introduced into the confessions of faith? Dangers of the position that there is only one catholic church? Advantages of it? False notion soon engrafted upon the idea of the one catholic church? Attitude of Cyprian towards the claims of the Roman bishop? (§ 33.) Grounds of excommunication in the early church? Mode of reädmission into the church? Grades of penance for reädmission? Time when these grades became established? (§ 34.) Points involved in the schisms of Felicissimus, Novatian, and Meletius? Account of the schism of Felicissimus? Account of the Novatian schism? Account of the Meletian schism? (§ 69.) Change, in the second period, in the relations of the Church to the State? Ecclesiastical position of the Roman emperor? Advantages and disadvantages of this to the Church? Governmental favors granted to the church? Bearing of distinguished bishops towards imperial pretensions? (§ 70.) Form of polity which gradually came into existence during the second period? Position of the bishop in this period? Position of the other clergy? New ecclesiastical officers of the second period? Statutes for restricting the number of applications for clerical office? What restriction from the rules of celibacy? Manner of electing the clergy in the second period? Arrangements for clerical education in the second period? Principal theological seminaries? Mistaken views, in some quarters, respecting preparation for the clerical office? (§ 71.) Claims of the hierarchical prelacy of the second period? Position of the country bishops in the last half of the second period? Position and powers of the metropolitan bishops in the last half of the second period? Position and powers of the patriarchs? Position and claims of the Roman bishop in the last half of the second period? The ablest advocate of these claims? Attitude of the Eastern and North-African churches towards the Romish claims? Theory and structure of general councils in the second period? Mode of convening them? Rise of a body of ecclesiastical law? (§ 72.) Principal separatist movement in the second period? Account of the origin of the Donatist party? Donatist theory of the church and church discipline? Sketch of the contest between the Donatists and the Catholic church? Final history of the Donatist party? Criticism upon the Donatist schism?

LIFE AND WORSHIP.

§§ 35—39; 73—80.

(§ 35.) State of discipline in the early church? Relation of fellow Christians to each other? Vows and renunciations connected with church-membership? Characteristics of the first Ascetics? The most distinguished of them? Feeling of the early church towards Monasticism? (§ 36.) Order of exercises in the early Christian assemblies? Character of the lyrical part of the services? (§ 37.) First place of assembling for the Christians? Arrangements afterwards? Date of the first church edifices? Worship in the cemeteries? Feeling of the early church towards images? First employment of symbolical religious figures? Meaning of the monogram *ἰχϑύς*? Decree of the Synod of Elvira respecting the use of emblematic figures in churches? Use of the sign of the cross? (§ 38.) Times when the first Christians assembled for worship? Reasons for selecting a particular day? Date of the universal observance of Sunday? Mode of observing Sunday? Observance of the Jewish Sabbath in the early church? Wednesday and Friday, how observed by the early church? Purpose and mode of observing Easter? Dispute respecting the time of Easter? Purpose of the observance of Whitsunday or the feast of Pentecost? Observance of Christmas in the first period? What did the feast of Epiphany commemorate? Veneration of martyrs in the first period? Vigiliæ? (§ 39.) Preparation for baptism in the early church? Profession of faith at baptism? Theory and practice respecting infant baptism in the first period? What early symbols were used in connection with baptism? Probabilities in favor of the Apostolical origin of infant baptism? Improbabilities in favor of the Apostolical origin of infant baptism? Modes of baptism in the first period? Times for baptism in this period? Date of the customs of unction and confirmation? Controversy respecting baptism by heretics? Frequency of communion in the early church? Manner of administering it? Where was infant communion practised? When and how did the Eucharist assume a more formal aspect? Sense in which the sacrament was called "oblatio" in the early church? First appearance of the Papal idea of the sacrament? Account of the Agape? Extraordinary administrations of the Supper in the first period? (§ 73.) Best specimens of Christian character in the second period? Character of much of the ordinary membership? Reäction against the low state of piety in the church? (§ 74.) Native source of the monachist tendency? Influence of Christianity upon it? Sketch of the father of monachism? Influence of his example in Egypt and Syria? Effect of monachism upon State and Church? Efforts of the government to check the eremite tendency? Character of the mendicant monks of the East? Attempts of leading churchmen in the East to reform monachism? Distinction between Anchorites and Coenobites? Remarkable examples of each? Feeling towards monachism in the Western church? Churchmen particularly concerned in introducing monachism into the West? Most distinguished Western cloisters in the second period? By whom was monachism reformed and consolidated? Sketch of his character and monastic method? Prevalence of his reformatory system? (§ 75.) Character of the opposition to the ascetic spirit in the second period? Decrees of Gangra? Views and efforts of Helvidius, Bonosus, Jovinian, and Vigilantius, in opposition to monachism? Attitude of Jerome and Augustine towards these reäctionary endeavors? (§ 76.) Change in the style of worship in the second period? New class of ecclesiastics? Character of church music? Cultivation of hymnology in the second period? Distinction between the missa catechumenorum and missa fidelium? When, and why, was this distinction lost? (§ 77.) Change in the structure and decoration of church edifices in the second period? Principal parts of the church edifice? Feeling, in this period, respecting the use of pictures and images in churches? Use of the figure of the cross? (§ 78.) Observance of Sunday in the second period? Decisions of the council of Laodicea respecting Sunday and Sabbath? Decisions of the emperors respecting Sunday? What fast preceded Easter in the second period? Division of the Easter festival? Settlement of the dispute respecting Easter by the council of Nice? Who were the Quartodecimani? Manner of publishing the time for Easter? Observance of Pentecost in the second period? Observance of Christmas in the second period? Observance of Epiphany? (§ 79) Universality of infant baptism in the second period? Classification of catechumens? Two kinds of unction? Change in the manner of celebrating the Supper in the second period? Altered view of the nature of this sacrament in the second period? Prayer for the dead in the second period? Infrequency of partaking of the communion? Observance of the Agape in this period? (§ 80.) Veneration of martyrs in the second period? Particular feasts in commemoration of individuals? Manner in which the superstitious veneration of saints showed itself? By whom was it opposed? By whom defended? Veneration of the Virgin by the Collyridianians? Views of the Antidicomarianites? Feeling of the church towards both? Pilgrimages in the second period? Opposition to superstition and ecclesiasticism by Aërius?

HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

§§ 40—60; 81—94.

(§ 40.) Basis of the doctrinal system of the Patristic period? Condition of the New Testament canon in the first period? The Antilegomena and Homologoumena? Determination of the Canon in its present form? Degree of doctrinal agreement among the fathers of the first period? Two doctrinal tendencies in the primitive church? Representatives of each? Influence of each tendency? (§ 41.) Four classes of heretical sects in the first period? (§ 42.) Mention the so-called Arch-heretics. (§ 43.) Composition of the membership of the early church? Describe the Ebionites. The Nazarenes. Certainty of the information respecting these two sects? Describe the Elcesaites. (§ 44.) Meaning of Gnosis in the New Testament sense? In the Gnostic sense? Two species of Gnosticism? Describe the Judaistic. Gnostic Describe the Anti-Judaistic Gnostic. Problems that engaged the Gnostic mind? Two errors beneath Gnosticism? Difference between the Alexandrine and the Syrian Gnosticism? Gnostic idea of redemption? Three Gnostic views of the person of Christ? Ethics and morals of the Gnostics? The numbers of the Gnostics? Their final history? (§ 45.) Date, residence, and doctrines of Cerinthus? (§ 46.) Date, residence, and system of Basilides? Basilidean theory of Judaism? Basilidean theory of Christianity? (§ 47.) Date, residence, and system of Valentinus? Relative position of the Valentineans among the Gnostics? Principal disciples of Valentinus? (§ 48.) Date, country, and scheme of the Ophite Gnostics? Sects allied to the Ophites? (§ 49.) Date, country, and scheme of Saturninus? (§ 50.) Date, residence, and scheme of the Encratites? (§ 51.) Principal schools of the Antinomian Gnostics, and their locality? (§ 52.) Date, residence, and views of Marcion? The Marcionite canon? Chief opponent of Marcion? (§ 53.) Date, residence, and scheme of Hermogenes? Chief opponent of Hermogenes? What Scripture doctrine was most directly opposed to the speculation and schemes of Gnosticism? The Mosaic idea of creation? Conception of creation in the Apostolic Epistles? Conception of creation in the early church? Authors cited? Influence of the Platonic idea of creation upon some of the early fathers? (§ 54.) Points of agreement between Manichaeism and Gnosticism? Points of disagreement? Account of the founder of the Manichaean sect? Sketch of the Manichaean scheme? Manichaean estimate of the Old Testament and of the New? Structure of the Manichaean church? Manner of Manichaean worship? Fortunes of the sect. (§ 55) The fundamental error of Montanism? Schwegler's theory of Montanism? Account of Montanus? His success and chief adherents? Montanistic theory of the church and church ordinances? Doctrinal views of the Montanists? Source, and sketch, of the Chiliastic theory? Principal defenders of it? Attitude of the primitive church towards Chiliasm? Principal opponents of Chiliasm? Final history of Chiliasm? Attitude of the modern Protestant church towards Chiliasm? (§ 56.) Doctrines around which the heresies of the first period turned? Three classes of Anti-Trinitarians? State the Patripassian theory. Its representatives? State the theory of the second class of Anti-Trinitarians. Its representatives? State the theory of the third class of Anti-Trinitarians. Its representatives? Point from which the speculative construction of the doctrine of the Trinity proceeded in the early church? Logos-doctrine in the Jewish theology? In the Platonic philosophy? In the New Platonic? Logos-doctrine of Philo? Modern ontological argument for the doctrine of the Trinity? Current Jewish idea of the Messiah at the time of the Advent? Use made of the Logos-doctrine by John? Trinitarianism of the Apostolic Fathers? Logos-doctrine of Justin Martyr? Of Tatian? Of Athenagoras? Of Irenaeus? Of Tertullian? Of Hippolytus? Of Lactantius? Of Clement of Alexandria? Of Origen? Of Dionysius of Alexandria? The Roman-Occidental Trinitarianism compared with the Alexandrine-Oriental? What scheme intermediate to these two? Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the first period? (§ 57.) Sketch of Barnabas and his epistle? Sketch of Hermas and his treatise? Sketch of Clement of Rome and his writings? Sketch of the pseudo-Clementine writings? Sketch of Ignatius and his writings? Account of the controversy respecting the Ignatian epistles? Sketch of Papias and his writings? Writings of the pseudo-Dionysius? Sketch of Justin Martyr and his writings? (§ 58) Theological tendency of the Asia-

Minor and North-African churches? Sketch of Irenaeus and his writings? Of Hippolytus and his writings? Of Julius Africanus and his writings? Of Tertullian and his writings? Of Cyprian and his writings? (§ 59.) Origin of the Alexandrine Theological Seminary? Its founder and teachers? Theological tendency in this school? Definition of the Alexandrine Gnosis? Whence derived? Alexandrine estimate of natural religion? Of Judaism? Sketch of Pantaenus and his writings? Of Clement of Alexandria and his writings? Sketch of Origen? Sketch of Origen's writings? Origen's Theodicy? Origen's Anthropology? Origen's Exegesis? Origen's Biblical Criticism? Sketch of Dionysius Alexandrinus and his writings? Sketch of Gregory Thaumaturgus? Of Pamphilus? Of Methodius? (§ 60.) Account of the Antiochian school? (§ 81.) Relation of the theologizing of the second period to that of the first? Origin and aim of the theological controversies of the second period? Evils and benefits of these controversies? Attitude of the Oriental and the Occidental mind in these controversies? Three principal tendencies in the doctrinal history of the second period? Representatives of each? (§ 82.) First great controversy of the second period? Occasional causes of this controversy, existing in the preceding period? Views generally held, in the church, of the nature of the Son? What two doctrines were regarded as reconciling the unity with the trinality? In what writers does this Trinitarianism appear? View of Arius? Middle theory between that of the church and that of Arius? Its points of agreement and disagreement with the church theory? Logical defects of the Semi-Arian scheme? (§ 83.) Account of the rise of Arianism and of the first opposition to it? What writings of Arius are extant? Theologians who favored Arius? Attitude of Constantine, at first, towards Arianism? His subsequent attitude? Date of the Council of Nice? Composition of the council? By whom was the middle theory defended in this council? Principal defender of the church theory? Principal positions of the Nicene Symbol? Course taken by Eusebius and the middle party in adopting the symbol? Fortunes of Arius? (84.) What led to the recall of the exiled Arian bishops, and the reopening of the controversy? Stand taken by Athanasius in respect to the requisition of the emperor? Decision of the council of Tyre? Athanasius's objection to Arianism, in reference to the doctrine of Christ as a mediator? Athanasian definition of "eternal generation"? Athanasius's objection to the doctrine of similarity of essence? Date and place of the first exile of Athanasius? Death of Arius? Recall of Athanasius? Attitude of the emperor Constantius? Character of the five confessions drawn up by the Semi-Arians? Attitude of the Western church in the controversy between Athanasius and his opponents? Views of Marcellus of Ancyra? Of Photinus? Use made of these erroneous theories by the opponents of Athanasius? Mode in which the condemnation of Athanasius in the West was effected? Date and place of the second exile of Athanasius? (§ 85.) Subsequent relation of the Semi-Arians to the Arians? Views of the Anomœans? Of the Homœousians? Tactics of the Arians to keep united with the Semi-Arians? Characteristics of the second Sirmian Symbol? Of the third Sirmian Symbol? Result at Ariminum in 359? Influence of the accession of Julian upon the controversy? Result of the council convened at Alexandria, in 362, by Athanasius? Effect of the Meletian schism upon the controversy? Date and circumstances of Athanasius's death? Sketch of the writings of Athanasius? Effect of the distractions of the Eastern church upon the Semi-Arians? What three theologians contributed much to the success of the Nicene faith in the East? Sketch of Basil and his writings? Of Gregory Nyssa? Of Gregory Nazianzen? Influence of Origen upon these minds? Effect of the death of Valens and the accession of Theodosius the Great upon the controversy? Date and place of the second œcumenical council? Leading mind in this council? Views of the Macedonians? Decisions of this council? Sketch of Ambrose and his writings? Fortunes of the Arians after 381? (§ 86.) Relation of the chief Greek theologians of the fourth century to Origen? What two other classes? Representatives of each? Sketch of Epiphanius and his writings? Of Jerome and his writings? Jerome's Biblical labors? Sketch of Rufinus and his writings? Of Chrysostom and his writings? His connection with the Origenistic controversies in Egypt? Sketch of Synesius and his writings? (§ 87.) Error of the Docetæ respecting the person of Christ? Of the Patripassians? Of the Ebionites? General Christological docrine of the church in the first period? The two extremes to which the doctrine of Christ's Person is exposed? Christology of the Arians? Christological views of Marcellus and Photinus? Christology of Apollinaris? Christological tendency of the Alexandrine church during the second period? Of the Antiochian church? Charge made by each against the other? (§ 88.) Prelude, in the West, to the Nestorian controversy in the East? Influence of the rivalry between Alexandria and Constantinople upon the Nestorian controversy? Sketch of the Nestorian controversy? Date and decision of the third œcumenical council? Final history of Nestorius? The error of Nestorius? The error of Cyril? The fortunes of the adherents of Nestorius? (§ 89.) Occasion of the reopening of the controversy respecting the Person of Christ? View of Eutyches? First opposition to it? Decisions of the Robber-Synod? Part which Leo of Rome took in the controversy? Time and place of the fourth œcumenical council? Doctrinal decisions at Chalcedon? Reception of them by the Monophysite party? (§ 90.) Negative effect of the Monophysite controversy upon Christology? Sketch of the Monophysite contest in Egypt? Method of settling the controversy employed in the Henoticon? Sketch of the contest in Syria? Divisions among the Monophysites? Efforts of the emperor Justinian to settle the Monophysite controversy? Influence of the Origenistic controversies upon the Monophysites? Edict of the Three Chapters? Attitude of the Western (particularly the Roman) church during the controversy? Time and place of the fifth œcumenical council? Its decisions? Their reception in the West? History of the Monophysite party after the council at Constantinople? (§ 91.) Principal seat of the Anthropological controversy? General form of Anthropological statement in the Patristic period? The more specific points upon which controversy arose? Respective attitude of the Oriental and Occidental churches? Representative theologians upon each side? The two minds in whom the antagonism finally met and broke forth into controversy? Sketch of Augustine's life? Account of his writings? Influence of Augustine's inward experience upon his theology and anthropology? Augustine's earlier theory of regeneration? Treatises in which this theory appears? Augustine's final theory of regeneration? Statement of the Augustinian doctrine of sin and grace? Augustine's idea of the will and of moral freedom? Sketch of Pelagius? Writings of Pelagius? His theory of sin and grace? His idea of will and moral freedom? Difference between the Augustinian and the Pelagian view of the relation of the finite to the infinite? Difference between the two views of the apostasy? (§ 92.) First ecclesiastical action respecting Pelagianism? Positions taken by Cœlestius at the Synod of Carthage? Result of the Synod? Reason, on the part of Pelagius, for transferring the controversy from the West to the East? Result of the Synods at Jerusalem and Diospolis? Purpose of Augustine's treatise De gestis Pelagii? Decisions of the Synods of Mileve and Carthage in 416? Attitude of the Roman bishops in the controversy? Issue of the Pelagian controversy as settled by the Synod of Carthage in 418? Action of the general council of Ephesus respecting Pelagianism? Did strict Augustinianism ever prevail in the East? Anthropology of Theodore of Mopsuestia? His view of nature and grace, or of creation and redemption? (§ 93.) Logical result of the Pelagian controversy, in reference to the doctrine of regeneration? What led to the reässertion of the synergistic theory of regeneration? First beginnings of the Semi-Pelagian controversy in North Africa? Augustine's relation to it? Account of Semi-Pelagianism in Southern Gaul? Principal advocates of it? Cassian's theory of grace and free will? Endeavor of Augustine to overcome Semi-Pelagianism in Southern Gaul? His success? Attitude of the Roman bishop Coelestinus? Augustinianism of Prosper and Leo? Augustinianism of the Predestinationists? Theory of Vincent of Lerins for determining the sense of Scripture? Decisions of the councils of Arles and Lyons? Augustinianism in Africa and Italy? Views of Fulgentius and Cæsarius? Decisions of the councils at Orange and Valence? Did the theoretic Augustinianism asserted in these councils continue to prevail in the Western church? (§ 94.) Difference between the sects of the earlier and those of the later centuries? Account of the Audians? Condition of the Gnostics and Manichæans in the second period? Revival of Manichæism by Faustus? Sketch of Priscillian and his party? Account of the Rhetorians? Of the Hypsistarians? Of the Euphemites and Coelicolæ?

Nazarene Theological College
B12950

Books are to be returned on or before
the last date below

15 NOV 1978

08 OCT 1986

LIBREX —

270.1
AUTHOR
G932m Guericke, Henry E. F.

TITLE
5719 A manual of
Church history

Date	Name
15 NOV 1978	Anne
08 OCT 1986	John
	R

270.1
G932m
5719

Guericke

BRITISH ISLES NAZARENE
LIBRARY
COLLEGE